Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XXV, No. 10. JANUARY, 1936.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.
ASSISTANT EDITOR: M. T. DUNLOP, M.A.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:	
'It is not enough': the Archbishops' Peace Appeal	541
Voluntary Euthanasia	543
The Church and the Coming Social Order	545
Calendar Reform and a Fixed Easter	546
Dr. Longford and the 'Tablet'	547
The Modern Churchmen's Conference, 1936	550
A Notable Primacy — Professor J. M. Creed.	550
Christianity and Paganism in Germany — H. P. Kingdon, M.A.	559
The Jubilee of Mark Pattison's 'Memoirs' — A. M. Coleman.	566
The Dialectical Materialism of Karl Marx — Archibald Chisholm, D.D.	574
Book Reviews:	
The Age of Enlightenment	581
What to Believe	584
The Two Ezekiels	587
Peter Sterry	588
Contemporary Living Faiths	589
Correspondence	591

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

AMERICAN AGENT:

MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 18, 1931, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879 (Sec. 397, P.L.& R.).

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

All literary contributions should be addressed to:—
The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., Ripon Hall, Boars Hill, Oxford.

All orders for advertisements should be addressed to:—A. DARBY'S ADVERTISING SERVICE, Cobham House, 24-26 Water Lane, London, E.C.4. (Telephone: City 6686-7).

Published on the 15th of every month except August, September and October. A Triple Number is published in October.

AMERICAN CHURCHMEN

In sympathy with progressive aims are invited to subscribe to

'THE MODERN CHURCHMAN'

The Magazine for one year
$3.00

Communicate with—
MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY,
1423 Linden Avenue,
Baltimore, Maryland.

READERS of the *Modern Churchman* are asked to support our advertisers, and to mention the *Modern Churchman* when replying to advertisements in our pages.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 10. JANUARY, 1936. Vol. XXV.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

'It is not enough': the Archbishops' Peace Appeal.

The great Reformed Churches, in a fine spirit of Christian self-abnegation, offered to range themselves under the Pope for the purpose of making a united Christian appeal for peace. The Pope, for obvious reasons, but not reasons that are either morally or spiritually convincing, declined to co-operate. As a consequence, the different Christian communions have each made their appeal for peace in their own way. The appeal of the Church of England has appeared above the signatures of our two Archbishops and is entitled 'The Way of Peace.' The first half of the appeal is an expansion of the historic utterance of Nurse Cavell: 'Patriotism is not enough,' and the Archbishops add that science and civilization and 'international Treaties, Pacts and Covenants are not of themselves enough to ensure the peace which the world needs.'

The second part of the Archbishops' appeal proceeds to develop the positive—we wish we could add also the practical—solution of our peace difficulties. It is based upon the words of our Lord: 'Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and His righteousness.' The Archbishops are convinced that if this were done always, everywhere, and by all human beings, universal and permanent peace would ensue. Although true, this is, as the Archbishops point out, not new. It is, moreover, as their

Graces affirm regretfully, an ideal which possesses less influence to-day than ought to be the case. The Archbishops, however, do not make clear why this is so, nor do they produce any practical remedies for it. We venture to think that the ineffectiveness of this ideal of the Kingdom of God is to be found in the state of the Christian Church itself. The Church of God has failed to be what it ought to be and to do what it ought to do. That failure, many will feel, our Church authorities are making no adequate effort to remedy. It seemed in the days of the Great War, and for a brief period that followed it, that the Church of England, at any rate, was going to secure a great moral and spiritual reformation within itself, and was going to put first things first; the principles and ideals of the Kingdom of God before dogmatic and ceremonial accretions, and ecclesiastical traditions and controversies. Within a short space, however, the forces of reaction gained the upper hand and as a consequence the ideal of the Kingdom of God, as a practical Church policy, fell into the background. Let us hope that the present crisis is going once again to give strength and influence to the ideal of the Kingdom. When, in its own policy and practice, the Church puts the Kingdom of God first, then there will be some hope that the nations of the world will be induced, in a greater degree than at present, to put the ideal of the Kingdom first in their national and international policies.

Many readers of the Archbishops' appeal feel keen disappointment that, on such an occasion as this, no mention was made of the League of Nations, nor any indication given that if it acts with justice, wisdom and courage in the present crisis, it will be making a real contribution to the advancement of the Kingdom of God in human affairs.

International covenants may not be enough, and self-sacrificing loyalty to them may not be enough to secure permanent and universal peace, but at least they constitute a most influential factor in the securing of such a blessed consummation. All practical help given to the League at the present time is an act of service to the Kingdom of God, and we could wish that their Graces had said so in clear and incisive language to our nation in its day of trial. We are assured that the Archbishops are ardent believers in the League of Nations, and therefore we do

the more regret that their appeal for peace on this occasion should have been as colourless in its attitude towards the League as if that appeal had issued from the Vatican and not from this sceptred isle.

Voluntary Euthanasia.

The recent formation of a society by Dr. Killick-Millard, to promote legislation permitting voluntary euthanasia, demands the serious consideration of the Christian public of this country. In the ancient pagan world of Greece and Rome, their moralists saw nothing wrong in a man taking his own life under certain circumstances. These circumstances, so Epictetus taught, were like the commander's trumpet sounding the retreat, which when he heard, the good soldier would not hesitate to obey. This obedience was regarded as entirely honourable and courageous. It was not an act of disobedience to the Divine Will, but of submission to it. The Christian religion, however, changed this view of voluntary death. It permitted, nay commanded, human beings to sacrifice their lives freely for the sake of their religion and for the sake of their fellow-men, but it did not permit them to take their lives in order to escape from agony or ignominy. These things, it was taught, were in the hand of God, and the human being must submit to them until God intervened to put an end to his agony. As a consequence, Christian men and women have been content, with heroic fortitude, to endure almost intolerable agony and shame rather than take their lives or ask others to take them for them. Christian moralists have taught that suicide of every kind is self-murder and the laws of this country find that any sane man, who takes his own life, is guilty of a felony.

With the growth of humanitarian feeling and the conviction that God does not intervene directly to suspend or break those natural laws which operate in such matters as birth and death, there has arisen a doubt as to the rightness of the Christian condemnation of voluntary death under all circumstances. Just as eugenics would place the birth of a human being entirely within the sphere of the operation of the human reason and conscience, so also the protagonists for voluntary euthanasia would place the time and mode of death under the same control. Eugenics and

euthanasia really mean making man God's vice-gerent in these important matters of human birth and human death. It is not for the uncontrolled operation of the laws of nature to decide these matters; it is for the human, rational and moral consciousness, inspired by the Spirit of God, to decide them.

It is still within the memory of some what opposition was offered by many sincere Christians to the use of anaesthetics. It was felt that to take an anaesthetic, especially in childbirth, was to circumvent the expressed will of God. Christian scruples against the use of anaesthetics have now generally disappeared. Scruples also against the responsible and judicious use of contraceptives are slowly but surely disappearing. It is felt that human parents, now possessing the knowledge and the power to control the number of their children, ought to exercise that power intelligently and conscientiously. We have little doubt that in time Christian sentiment in this country will approve of voluntary euthanasia.

We are glad to observe that a number of prominent Churchmen, including Dr. Inge, Dean Matthews, Rev. C. F. Russell, Canon Peter Green, Canon Creed, Canon Raven, Canon Payne, Canon H. R. L. Sheppard, the Master of the Temple and others, have defended euthanasia as not contrary to Christian principles. We are not less glad to observe that two leading and greatly respected Free Churchmen, Principal Wheeler Robinson and Dr. Rhondda Williams (Chairman of the Congregational Union) have also justified voluntary euthanasia.

It will be no easy matter to secure legal sanction for euthanasia, but the first and most important step towards securing it is the education of public opinion. With this purpose in view, a society has been formed[1] entitled 'Voluntary Euthanasia Legalization Society.' Its precise purpose is defined as follows:

> 'Individuals who have attained to years of discretion, and who are suffering from an incurable and fatal disease which usually entails a slow and painful death, should be allowed by law, *if they so desire* and if they have complied with requisite conditions, to substitute for the slow and painful death a quick and painless one.'

The individual who takes this action will doubtless bear in mind, not simply his own suffering but the sufferings of relations and friends.

[1] Hon. Sec.: Dr. Killick-Millard, The Gilroes, Leicester.

THE CHURCH AND THE COMING SOCIAL ORDER.

Mr. Kenneth Ingram in his recent *The Coming Civilization*[1] asserts that the whole trend of the social movement is towards the achievement of a 'non-competitive, classless' order. We very much doubt whether this kind of society can be universally achieved, and we are certain that the loss of values involved would quickly lead to its abandonment for a differentiated competitive society in which the differentiation would be determined more by personal worth than at present and in which competition would be rid of various evils which exist in our present competitive system but are not inherent in it. If, however, Mr. Ingram be right in his prognostications and he expects the change to come shortly and suddenly, the Church will do well to prepare herself for the coming social order by progressively assimilating herself to it.

We imagine that it will be impossible to retain classes in the Christian ministry where there are none in the democratic community — all our clergy will therefore have to be of one order. With the equalization of status will come equalization of stipend. These stipends will be provided by the State if the State regards the pastoral work of the clergy as a necessary factor in the welfare of the community. Should the State not do so, the clergy, as clergymen, will receive no stipends, since all property except a human being's personal belongings will be the possession of the State. Hence the stipendless clergy will do their pastoral work in their leisure time, of which we are assured there will be great abundance in the coming social democratic order. Thus the condition of things in the primitive Christian Church will be reproduced, for in it the clergy received no stipends and did their pastoral work in their leisure time. A Church which has no problems of finance or patronage should be free to devote itself entirely to spiritual and moral tasks.

No doubt our Church Assembly, which devotes itself mainly to financial and patronage problems, might feel it had been deprived of its *raison d'être*, but Churchmen generally would probably not miss the Church Assembly any more in their Church life than they would miss the impressive ceremony of taking up the collection at our church services.

[1] Published by George Allen and Unwin, 6/. 1935.

In the new order the method of appointing the clergy to their office would probably change. The laity, not the bishops, would select 'the servant of the servants of God.' Possibly the election of clergy in a society in which all are equal, would be performed by lot, as being less invidious, and so another return would be made to apostolic precedent.

This method of appointing the clergy would undoubtedly lead to the decentralization of Church organization and the substitution of local government — yet another return to the primitive Church where the Christian congregation in each little town governed itself. Church people would thus direct Church affairs in their own areas and adapt their Church services and organization to their local needs. Moral and spiritual union would be maintained between the localities by means of the broadcasting of inspiring and impressive Christian teaching. As a consequence, Christian unity would be secured for the Church as a whole by unity of ideals and spirit, and in local spheres by Christian fellowship, co-operation and united worship.

We cannot think that such changes should prove detrimental to the moral and spiritual influence of the Church.

Calendar Reform and a Fixed Easter.

Two notable changes in English times and seasons have been secured by the exertions of members of the Modern Churchmen's Union. It was Lord Avebury, one of our earliest members, who secured the August Bank Holiday, or St. John Lubbock's Day, as it was then facetiously named. Mr. Willett, another of our members, at a later date, successfully promoted the daylight saving measure which has become a permanent feature of our English life notwithstanding the protests of Lord Hugh Cecil and the lamentations of the herds of milch cows. It remains for another member of the Modern Churchmen's Union to secure for English people the blessing of a fixed Easter. Unfortunately, or rather fortunately, for we now all think internationally, this blessing must be secured for all or none, and although the whole world, when it judges no doubt judges soundly, yet it takes a very long time to make up its mind.

Easter, as every student of Church history knows, has been a very troublesome festival to keep. The controversy as to the

precise day of the week on which it ought to be kept threatened to split the Church in two in the second and third centuries, and it required the first General Council of Nicaea to settle the dispute.

These troubles have been mainly due to Easter being associated with the Jewish Passover and with the phases of the moon. Is it necessary that the Christian Church should be tied to either? So long as Easter Day be kept on Sunday the Christian Church can have no reasonable objection to a fixed Easter, nor the secular world either, provided Easter Monday be also a holiday.

It is well to recall that for a considerable period the Christian Church had no universally accepted day for keeping the birth of the Saviour. It was Pope Julius I who in the year 351 A.D. selected the winter solstice as the appropriate time for keeping the rising of the 'Sun of Righteousness' (*Mal.* iv, 2). It is clear that we need the assistance and the authority of a present-day Pope to enable the Christian world to secure a fixed and universally acceptable Easter, and he is hardly likely to be a member of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

Besides being kept on a Sunday many would advocate that Easter should be kept in the spring, as it is the festival of the renewal of life. The difficulty here is that the spring, south of the Equator, cannot coincide with spring north of the Equator; hence a fixed Easter which is to fall in the spring-time in every part of the world is impossible.

In the interests of the influence of the Christian religion it is important that the religious festival and the popular holiday should coincide. If, however, the Christian Churches cannot be got to agree to a fixed Easter, then we shall have at no distant date the separation of the popular spring holiday from the religious festival, and a consequent loss of beneficial contact between the religious and the national life. The League of Nations, amid its multifarious activities, is interested in securing a fixed Easter, and if Rome, Constantinople and Canterbury cannot agree among themselves the League must in the end act without them.

Dr. Longford and the *Tablet*.

The publication of the Life of Randall Davidson by his former chaplain, Dr. Bell, presents evidence which completely

justifies a statement made by Dr. Longford at the Cambridge Conference in 1933. On that occasion, in the discussion on his Conference paper, which was already in print, Dr. Longford informed the Conference that a very general misunderstanding had occurred in connection with the General Strike in 1926 when Cardinal Bourne's manifesto had been contrasted with the Appeal put out by Archbishop Davidson in the name of the Christian Churches. Dr. Longford pointed out that the Archbishop of Canterbury had acted as the promulgator of a joint appeal to which Cardinal Bourne was a party, but not a signatory, and that the Cardinal's condemnation of the Strike in Westminster Cathedral on the Sunday following was an act of bad faith.

The *Tablet* of September 2nd, 1933, characterized this statement as falsehood and calumny. Its editor went on to say :

> 'The onus of proof rests with Dr. Longford. No onus of disproof rests at this stage on any Catholic. But, to save time, we hereby declare that Dr. Longford's tale about the Archbishop of Westminster is . . . disgracefully false . . . [The Editor of the Tablet] 'remembers distinctly the many callers and telephone-ringers who importuned him all day long on behalf of a proposed collective declaration by "the Christian Churches." Our Editor emphatically testifies — and will be prepared to do so if necessary, on oath, in another place — that this new Longford story is not only untrue, but is the truth's flat opposite. Responsible Catholic journalists were in touch with the Church's leaders in May 1926, and we do not hesitate to call this "Broken Pact" story a shameful and a spiteful falsehood. No pact could have been broken, for the simple reason that his Eminence Cardinal Bourne never made any pact at any time, in any place, on any subject with Archbishop Davidson. We do not envy the Modern Churchmen their Dr. Longford. With Lord Davidson dead, and Cardinal Bourne absent from public life during convalescence, the story circulated from the Conference is one for the Modern Churchmen to repudiate.'

On the publication of the Conference number, the Editor of the *Tablet* suggested that an editorial trick had been resorted to, and that the passage under criticism had been omitted from the printed report deliberately. The passage had in fact never been in Dr. Longford's printed paper. Dr. Coulton, Chairman of the Conference session at which Dr. Longford spoke, was attacked for permitting such a false statement to pass. He accordingly consented to dissociate himself from Dr. Longford, if on examining Dr. Longford's evidence, he found it insufficient. His letter to the *Tablet*, after examination of the evidence, was held

up till after the death of Cardinal Bourne. Before it was published, the Editor wrote and asked Dr. Coulton whether in view of Cardinal Bourne's death he would not give it a different *tournure*. Dr. Coulton has dealt with this incident in his last book, *Critic and Convert*, the publication of which was the occasion of another violent attack by the *Tablet* in which both Dr. Coulton and Dr. Longford were held up to obloquy.

In Randall Davidson's Life (pp. 1,304 *f.*) the history of the General Strike is related with quotations from the Archbishop's diary and correspondence. From these it appears that on Friday, May 7th, the Archbishop arranged to issue a broadcast appeal. He then consulted Mr. Ramsay Macdonald and Mr. Baldwin, sending his chaplain to see Cardinal Bourne.

> 'During my absence from Lambeth that afternoon, Narborough called at Cardinal Bourne's with a copy of the Appeal, asking for his concurrence. The Cardinal was out, but on his return, he caused a message to be sent expressing his agreement with the document, but asking (like Ramsay Macdonald) that the withdrawal of the Strike should be the first of the three suggestions' (p. 1,307).

We are then told of the form in which the Appeal stood, as finally approved by the Archbishop, the President of the Free Church Council and Cardinal Bourne. Mr. Reith then withdrew permission for the broadcast. Archbishop Davidson protested and in a letter to Mr. Reith on May 7th, stated 'Cardinal Bourne has expressed his full concurrence with it.' The Appeal was refused a place in the *British Gazette*, edited by Mr. Winston Churchill, some sections of Conservative opinion being strongly against it. It got into the diminutive *Times* on Saturday, May 8th. On Sunday morning at High Mass at Westminster Cathedral Cardinal Bourne denounced the Strike as 'a sin against the obedience that we owe to God . . . '

In his diary, the Archbishop records the following incident:

> 'Nall was very angry with me for our message and thought with Major Kindersley, who was with him, that we had done great harm and that the Church would suffer discredit . . . I showed them that they did not really understand what had passed . . . they amused me by saying, "What a contrast — your attitude and that of Bourne." I asked, "Are you aware that Bourne wholly approved of all that we said and himself suggested some of the words we had inserted?" This staggered them and amazed them' (p. 1,312).

Notwithstanding the weight of the evidence, the *Tablet* in its

issue of November 23rd, 1935 (p. 658) refused to withdraw its charges against Dr. Longford and concludes by declaring:

> 'As for the charge that our late Chief not only broke his word, but broke it "in order to gain popularity with the nation," we have only to express pity for the ignoble mind from which such a taunt could come' (p. 659).

Charity should be exercised in our judgment of the dead, but justice to the living must come first. Impelled by that conviction and with no doubt as to the verdict of our readers, we call attention, with regret, to this discreditable incident.

The Modern Churchmen's Conference, 1936.

The twenty-third annual Modern Churchmen's Conference will be held on August 17th—22nd, 1936, at Oxford. Somerville College will be its headquarters. Conference visitors remember gratefully on many former occasions their hospitable treatment by the authorities of Somerville. The amenities of the College are many, and these have been recently increased by the addition of a chapel. The Conference theme will be: '*What to Believe: or the Problems of Christian Faith in the Modern World.*' The Dean of St. Paul's, as President, will give the opening address on 'The Rights of Reason in Religion.'

A NOTABLE PRIMACY*

By the Rev. Professor J. M. Creed.

DR. Bell's Life of Archbishop Davidson is a full biography abounding in personal detail and human interest; more than that—it is a contribution of high importance to the history of the Church of England and of the Anglican Communion at large for a space of some fifty years. Nor is its importance confined to the merely ecclesiastical, for the late Primate inherited from his predecessors, above all from Archbishop Tait, a conception of the place and function of his office in the national life which encouraged full use of the many channels of communication with public men and public life which an age-long English tradition lays open to an Archbishop of Canterbury. Personal

* *Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury.* By G. K. A. Bell, Bishop of Chichester. 2 vols. Oxford University Press. 1935.

inclinations chimed in with duty; Archbishop Davidson was on terms of intimacy with innumerable men of affairs, and his biography is often of value to students of social and political, as well as of ecclesiastical, history. The whole work bears testimony to that intimate relationship of Church and State which has been and still is characteristic of this country.

At the age of 34 Davidson's hand was already on the helm. In 1882 the death of his father-in-law, Archbishop Tait, to whom for the last five years of his life he had been Domestic Chaplain, brought him for the first time into personal contact with Queen Victoria. His letters, his address, his person at once commended him to the queen, and won him her complete confidence. Archbishop Tait died on December 3rd, the Queen received Davidson on December 9th following, and four days later the young chaplain is already making discreet enquiries on his sovereign's behalf as to the health and strength of the Bishop of Winchester and his fitness to succeed to the vacant Primacy. More remarkable still, he is asked by the sovereign, 'What would the feeling of the Bishops be, looking to the *possibility* of the Bishop of Truro being chosen?' Davidson is able to preface his very judicious answer with the words: 'The knowledge I have gained from the private correspondence and the episcopal and other meetings of the last five years at Lambeth enables me, I think, to answer your Majesty's question with tolerable certainty.' This was the beginning of a most intimate association between Davidson and the Queen which lasted till the Queen's death. On every important appointment his opinion was asked. When he was absent from Windsor, whither he was brought as Dean in the summer of 1883, he and the Queen communicated on these matters by cipher. Davidson was a courtier but not in the bad sense of that term. His unique influence with the Queen was not in the long run diminished because he was not always complaisant. His judgment remained his own, and when on occasion he thought the Queen's judgment to be at fault, he was not afraid to stand his ground and to risk his position in the royal favour. Relations with Lambeth continued to be close; the disciple of Archbishop Tait became the friend and counsellor of his successor, and collaborated with him in almost all the arduous tasks of the Primacy. Davidson was consecrated Bishop

of Rochester in 1891, and translated to Winchester four years later. On Benson's death in 1896, the close contact which he had maintained with Lambeth ever since his first appointment as Domestic Chaplain to Tait twenty years earlier was for a time interrupted. He was not in Archbishop Temple's inner counsels; indeed the new Archbishop kept his own counsel. I own to enjoying the new note which breaks into the archiepiscopal correspondence with Temple's elevation. Here is an example:

> The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of Winchester.
>
> 5th February, 1897.
>
> 'Advise me how to stop the Queen from giving an extra week's holiday to Rugby, Harrow, Winchester, etc., this year. The holidays at the Public Schools have grown very much of late years and are really as long as is wholesome.
>
> 'Could it not be suggested that a whole holiday on the 22nd June would be the right thing? Tell me the right course to take.'

It appears that the business of the Primacy fell somewhat into arrears; Temple did not possess the gift of delegation. But the vigour of his mind even in old age, and the force of his character impressed themselves upon the Church and the country, and if there was a certain loss in administrative efficiency, that loss was more than balanced by conspicuous advantages.

Temple died in 1903, and, in accordance with general expectation, Davidson succeeded to the Primacy. He ruled for twenty-five years. By far the greater part of Dr. Bell's work is devoted to his rule at Lambeth; out of the multifarious detail of these many well-documented chapters certain broad characteristics of Davidson's activity as Primate are found to detach themselves. Perhaps the most conspicuous is his close contact with political developments and public life. In the earlier days of his Primacy especially, he was often a trusted mediator in political and constitutional problems; of peculiar interest is the part he played in the Irish Question on the eve of the outbreak of the Great War. Ever careful to dissociate himself from a party attachment, he was in close touch with the Prime Ministers of all the successive governments and was on terms of intimacy with most of them. He was assiduous in his attendance at the House of Lords, and frequently listened from the gallery to important debates in the Commons. Secondly, the reader cannot fail to be impressed with the manifold links between the see of

Canterbury and the Church abroad both in the empire and in foreign lands. Davidson took infinite pains in meeting the many calls upon him for help, guidance, counsel and support; while studiously avoiding even the appearance of Patriarchal claims —claims which if asserted would speedily dissever the fellowship of Anglican Churches—he used to the full the unique opportunities of his office in relation to the Church overseas. This side of his work brought to him a knowledge of conditions in the British Empire generally, which was in its way unrivalled. A third outstanding characteristic of his rule was his steady determination, so far as in him lay, to maintain the national character, and therefore by necessary implication the comprehensiveness, of the Church of England.

We must make some attempt to estimate the frame and character of the man. As a boy at Harrow he had won school prizes and was regarded as a promising candidate for a University scholarship, but he graduated at Oxford with a third class in the History School. This place, it is scarcely necessary to say, gives no indication of his mental calibre. He had hoped for a first, and he should in fact have been entered as *aegrotat*. Before he came up to Oxford he had been weakened by a serious accident, and during his time at the University he was obliged to interrupt his course owing to a breakdown in health; he again collapsed in the course of the final examination. The result was a real misfortune, for he appears never to have outgrown his own disappointment; and his failure at Oxford left him with a certain shrinking from the academic world. But though he certainly should have found a very different place in the Schools, it remains true that intellectual interests were never with him predominant. Sound practical judgment was his supreme quality. It is scarcely possible to exaggerate his skill, patience and pertinacity in negotiation. But this gift carried an almost inevitable weakness in its train; the skilful negotiator must be ready to compromise. Davidson was lacking in sympathy for the man who knew he must make his point at all costs. To such a one he felt that he was called to urge the existence of other points of view. Thus on Cheyne, who *knew* that the traditional view of the Old Testament would not do and said so, he pressed the need of allowing for Dr. Liddon's conviction that it must be

maintained. It is not unnatural and not unfair that he was not entirely trusted by either side. There is, it must be confessed, a certain monotony in his handling of ecclesiastical and theological problems; he seems always concerned to avoid a clear issue. There is interest in following his consummate skill in keeping different parties in play, but he does not himself contribute much towards the clarification of principles. Yet the debt of the whole Church to his leadership is very great. He was at his best when some overt challenge or appeal stirred him to put out all his strength. His composure never deserted him, but the need of asserting his comprehensive attitude against what appeared to him to be exaggeration could give unwonted warmth to his language and vigour to the expression of his thought. Three documents, as it seems to me, stand out in these volumes as examples of his utterance at its best; one is his public reply to Bishop Gore's Formal Protest against the nomination of Dr. Henson to the see of Hereford (ii, p. 875); the second a Private Letter to Mr. William Temple in reply to the demand of 'Life and Liberty' leaders that the Archbishop should approach the Government, the country then being in the throes of the Great War, with a request that they should make known to the Church at large 'on what terms Parliament is prepared to give freedom to the Church' (ii, pp. 962 foll.); the third a reply to an open letter from Dr. Barnes, *à propos* of a disturbance in St. Paul's Cathedral (ii, pp. 1,322 foll.).

Those who stand in the Liberal tradition owe much to the late Archbishop. The biography contains long and intimate correspondence between himself and Gore. Davidson defers to Gore's opinion, seldom meets him theologically on his own ground, yet steadily refuses to draw the final practical conclusion which Gore presses, *viz.* that his own particular dilution of traditional Christianity is to be tolerated but not another. Davidson was not himself a scholar, but he knew that the scholars must be kept in countenance. Writing in January 1917 of his own policy in these matters, he justly claims that he has really succeeded in what he tried to do.

> 'I feel pretty clear that I have, during my Archiepiscopate, contributed steadily and with considerable effect to the maintenance of a reasonably comprehensive spirit in our Church's polity. Bishop Gore of Oxford regards me as perilously lax in what I teach and practise as

regards the National character of the Church of England, a phrase to which he has a special antipathy. I am increasingly certain that the rigorist attitude is a mistaken one, and that we rightly inculcate and use an elasticity in these matters — an elasticity which I have sought not only to condone, but even to encourage in certain credal matters referred to above, wherein I have stood upon one side, and the rigorist Bishops on the other.

'In this department, therefore, of my general Episcopal purpose and practice, I think I have to a large extent succeeded in what I have tried to do and say' (ii, p. 797).

His wisdom and his success are the more remarkable when we observe that so far as the evidence of this biography reaches, he did not maintain personal touch with Liberal theologians to anything approaching the extent that he did with such men as Gore and Talbot. The few references to Bishop Percival leave the impression of a certain coolness between the two men. Had theological Liberals at that time been more strongly represented upon the bench, his way might have been easier. But while Davidson's anxiety to preserve the comprehensiveness of the Church was keen enough for him to damp down heresy hunts, his sense of present administrative problems appears to have prevented him from welcoming the advancement of able men whose opinions might occasion difficulty. Bishop Henson has placed it on record that he left Lambeth Palace after an interview with the Archbishop before his consecration to the see of Hereford with an impression that 'the Archbishop would like to throw me over if he decently could.' Dr. Bell's narrative does not make it clear that Henson was wrong. Another significant fact emerges from the record of an interview at this same time with Lloyd George, namely, that Davidson had previously discouraged the appointment of Rashdall to the Deanery of Carlisle.[2] Yet, except on the assumption that Gore's policy of 'thorough' was to be adopted, this was surely nothing more than a belated recognition of Dr. Rashdall's services to religion and learning.

Davidson's was a receptive mind. He talked with men who knew, and took counsel freely before he spoke; he was not afraid to change his mind, but his second thoughts were not always better or surer than his first. When the Unionist Government in 1904 proposed to introduce Chinese labour into the

[2] ii, p. 853.

Transvaal, Davidson made a courageous and effective criticism of the proposal in the House of Lords. Later, after further consultation, he weakened in his opposition and the scheme went through. It is the opinion of good judges that if he had not weakened he might have turned the scales against the proposal and thus prevented a discreditable episode in Imperial history. But then, at the time, he was not quite sure of his ground. When he was sure, he did not lack courage in taking his stand. Opinions still differ as to the wisdom of the Archbishop's attitude in the General Strike, but it is probably more widely appreciated and approved to-day than it was at the time. We may add that those who have been accustomed to play off Cardinal Bourne against the Archbishop will change their minds when they have read and weighed the story of Cardinal Bourne's dealings in this affair as they emerge from Dr. Bell's documented narrative.

In the important memorandum on his own policy as Archbishop, from which I have already quoted, Davidson speaks thus of his attempts to deal with Ritualism and allied problems :

> 'I come to the question of boundaries of legitimate ritual variety, and here I must sadly confess to myself that, whether it be my misfortune or my fault, I have been quite unsuccessful in introducing a comprehensiveness of a reasonable and, in a large sense, law-abiding kind. At this moment, January 1917, there is I think a larger body of clergy than there has ever been before who quite deliberately resent, and even defy, the exercise of episcopal authority for inculcating, or, if need be, enforcing compliance with what may be largely called Prayer Book rules. The contrast between that school to-day and the corresponding school in Tractarian days is not merely wide, but the two things are almost contradictory, and the very men who attach the most vital importance to episcopal succession and the episcopal system, are those who in practice are now turning to scorn episcopal direction or rule which they dislike. At this moment, January 28th, 1917, I am awaiting with genuine alarm discussions which may take place in Convocation ten days hence about Reservation, which would give evidence of a defiance of episcopal authority on the part of many hundreds of clergy who mean to insist on the right of priests and congregations to insist on the use of the Reserved Sacrament for purposes of devotion (as contrasted with Communion) in a way which would have been not only surprising, but repellent, to Lancelot Andrewes, or William Laud, or E. B. Pusey, or John Keble . . . Things are likely to develop quickly now, and there are undoubted elements of danger which may even lead to schism. All that I am here concerned to say about it, is that I can claim no success in any endeavours that I have made to produce a truer spirit of loyalty and harmony in these matters among the extremer Church partisans on the High Church side.'[3]

[3] ii, pp. 797 foll.

This is a moving confession. At the beginning of his Primacy, in response to a deputation of M.P.'s concerned at the growth of what on any showing was grave and irresponsible lawlessness, Davidson had said :

> 'There are a few men defiant of episcopal authority and really reckless of the true Church of England's spirit. You have seen or heard or read about the case of St. Michael's, Shoreditch. You have heard about the churches at Plymouth and Devonport where things are going on of a like kind. I say to you deliberately to-day that in my view of such cases, tolerance has reached, and even passed its limits . . . The initial response must of course in any such case rest with the several diocesan bishops; but speaking for myself, so far as in me lies, I assure you, using my words with a full sense of responsibility, I desire and intend that we should now act, and act sternly.'[4]

To whatever extent circumstances may be held to extenuate his failure, it must be allowed that this pledge was not redeemed. The position grew graver and authority took no serious step. In so far as these problems threatened the peace and unity of the Church Davidson was profoundly concerned, but, as Dr. Bell aptly points out, he was not at heart interested in the questions themselves. His chief concern was that the attention of the Church was being distracted from its true mission. For himself, he would have preferred to leave the Prayer Book essentially as it was. The real motive behind his support of the Revised Prayer Book was, not love of the innovations proposed for their own sake, but the desire to promote the peace and unity of the Church. Of course the failure of the measure in the Commons was a keen disappointment to the aged Archbishop, but he set a noble example of restraint :

> 'He never once,' writes his biographer, 'spoke a wounded, much less a bitter word'; and he issued forthwith an appeal 'that patience and charity may be exercised, and precipitate words and acts avoided.'

This is not the place to embark upon discussion of the merits and demerits of the Prayer Book Controversy, yet here I find myself obliged to register a note of dissent from Dr. Bell's version of the history. I think he makes mistakes, and I think his mistakes involve unfairness to those who differ from his own interpretation of the event. Speaking of the opposition in the Commons to the Revised Prayer Book, he writes :

> 'The whole attack was really an attack not only against the new Book but against the teaching of the Church of England itself: for it

[4] i, p. 399.

was the old Prayer Book quite as much as the new which taught the doctrines which Joynson Hicks deplored.'

Was it then, in the Bishop's view, mere accident, doctrinally insignificant, that at the Reformation the Church of England discontinued the practice of Reserving the Sacrament? And that, whereas the new Prayer Book proposed formally to allow perpetual Reservation of the Sacrament in church, the old Prayer Book did not allow any Reservation at all? I doubt whether the Bishop really thinks the question so insignificant, for on p. 1355 he refers to the issues raised by the new Book as 'of such profound religious interest' that 'division was inevitable.' He continues by declaring that the majorities who desired the book were composed of 'the instructed Church leaders and communicants'—the suggestion being that the opposition, though doubtless enthusiastic, was theologically incompetent. The facts are not so. Dr. Bell does indeed allow that 'not a few distinguished liturgical scholars, such as Dr. F. E. Brightman, were not altogether happy about the liturgical quality of important parts of the new Book.' But this is a very inadequate statement in view of the firm and considered opposition on historical, doctrinal and religious grounds of an English theologian whose name is known throughout Europe—Professor F. C. Burkitt. And Professor Burkitt did not stand alone. Dr. Bell himself clinches the argument against the parliamentary opposition to the Deposited Book with a citation of Article xxxvii, 'We give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the Sacrament.' The doctrine indeed is unimpeachable. What is not clear is its relevance to the purpose for which Dr. Bell cites it. Whom does it touch?

I regret this narrative because I think it is tendentious. But so far as my observation goes, it stands almost alone in the Biography in this respect. Dr. Bell has laid the Church and the Nation under a deep debt. The labour which has gone to the making of this book must have been immense. Dr. Bell has succeeded in presenting his ample material in an artistic form, and with a felicity of phrase which it would be an impertinence for me to praise. I only hope that these few pages of mine may stir some who read them to procure and to study for themselves this deeply interesting Life.

CHRISTIANITY AND PAGANISM IN GERMANY

By the Rev. H. P. Kingdon, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.

IT is widely supposed that the religious struggle now going on in Germany is a simple issue of Church *versus* State. That, for instance, is the impression generally given by the able and authoritative reports of the Berlin Correspondent of the *Times*. But frequent visits to Germany, and the perusal of some of the voluminous pamphlets and magazines now vomited forth from presses deprived of much of their former work by the 'unification' of political opinion, have convinced the present writer at any rate that the conflict goes deeper than that. It is at bottom more religious than political. Not only is National-Socialism (most explicitly in Rosenberg's *Myth of the Twentieth Century*) tantamount to a religion in the minds of its most ardent supporters. We are also confronted with a galaxy of unashamedly 'Pagan' religious organizations, some no doubt ephemeral outcrops of abnormal emotionalism, but others on an altogether firmer foundation, and whose expectations of life are as good as, if not better than, those of National-Socialism itself.

This may seem hard to believe. We are apt to dismiss the 'Pagans' Progress' with an unthinking jest. But if only because it has become almost axiomatic for English religious thought to be swayed by the theological fashions of Germany, we may do well to examine these new creeds more closely. After all, there is plenty of 'paganism' in England, and, if we are not careful, we may find ourselves confronted with similar (though surely not identical) developments nearer home.

It is impossible to understand these pagan manifestations unless one goes back at least fifty years and unearths some of the peculiar circumstances, theological and political, in which they have arisen. There is no space to do that adequately here. But, first and foremost, there can be no doubt that for many years the Christian Churches, even more than in England, have been losing touch with the people. It is often and probably

rightly held that Roman Catholicism is as well represented in Germany as anywhere; but this is partly because, ever since Eckhart, there has been a furtive tendency to modernism in German Catholicism, and yet for every liberal in the Church there have probably been ten who have followed their Führer's lapse into an apathy which verges upon opposition; and the residue is as stiffly and blindly orthodox as Rome itself.

But far more serious is the position of the Evangelical Churches. There has always been a tendency for the Lutheran Church to turn its back on mundane affairs, exalting the claims of a highly irrational 'faith' against those of reason, and calling on the faithful in their 'state of grace' to shun the sphere of 'nature'—which often includes culture and civilization to boot. This did not happen without protests from Reimarus and Lessing, and their like. Schleiermacher actually came to terms with the poetry and philosophy of the Romantic Movement—with the result that to-day many Lutherans refuse him the name of Christian. Again, the pre-war 'liberal theology' of Harnack, Troeltsch, and Bousset, following on the critical researches of Wrede and Wellhausen, was a magnificent attempt to give Christianity the dress which the age demanded, but it was so far in advance of the average evangelical that it never really got across from the lecture-room to the pulpit—still less to the congregations. The Church remained in the grip of a stiffly ecclesiastical bureaucracy recruited from the ranks of the 'respectable' bourgeoisie, with virtually no contacts with the working classes, the Youth Movement, or the *intelligentsia* in general, and slavishly Erastian in their desire to humour the State which paid their salaries. This passive acquiescence in the existing régime was of course a logical consequence of the above-mentioned Lutheran indifference to worldly affairs. He that was never against the State was for it. And actually the liberal theology did little to counteract this. For the exponents of 'the social gospel' were so few that they failed to leaven their lump. Many a prosperous business-man found it convenient to quiet his conscience and the murmurings of the Socialists with a dash of patriarchal moralizing. And the really Christian Liberals got swamped in a sea of Mammon and obscurantist orthodoxy.

Here surely is one of the causes of the Great War: here was a real '*trahison des clercs*.' And for this it is the poor liberals

who seem to get most of the blame. Instead of recognizing that pre-War Germany was never given *enough* liberal treacle to enable her to swallow the Christian pill, the post-War school of Karl Barth has been insisting that there should have been no treacle at all! There has been a general return to the strict scholasticism of Luther and his immediate successors. When a German Protestant speaks of 'the Gospel,' one usually finds that what he means is the thought of St. Paul as interpreted by Luther, and sometimes the more crabbed and intransigeant the interpretation, the more triumphantly is it flung out! [An unextreme example is the tendency (magnificently resisted, it is true, by the Confessionals in the teeth of their own tradition) to take the text 'the powers that be are ordained of God' out of its context as being a universal rule, forgetting that the *Apocalypse* and the second century Church referred to the said powers in anything but divine terms.] Now Luther was a religious genius, and his spirit is still shared by many of his followers: but he cannot be called a systematic thinker, and when the letter of his message is magnified at the expense of its spirit—as it is in the reactionary insistence on the creeds and articles of the fourth and sixteenth centuries—the result strikes the plain man as highly artificial and unreal. The Barthians recognize the parlous condition of the Church; and, rightly insisting that the 'Word of God' stands *behind* rather than *in* the text of the Bible, they can digest the acids of modern literary criticism: but their reversion to an uncompromising dualism that knows no links between God and the world, and harps upon the 'wholly otherness' of the 'numinous,' is surely an attempt to cure with an overdose of the disease. These homoeopathic methods have nearly proved fatal; for if God is really *wholly* other, as Barth and Otto insist, then surely Epicurus was right, and God doesn't bother about the world. He seems to be only interested in obscurantist theologians! Anyhow, the world ceases to bother about *Him*. How are the bewildered Hans and Gretchen to know that Barth and Otto do not mean to be taken literally when they say that God is '*wholly* other,' but rather to controvert the tendency, by no means confined to Hegel, of German idealists to identify the kingdom of Prussia with that of God? These extravagances have driven the Lutherans into the idolatry which worships only half—in this case the other half—of the truth;

and Barth's spirited pamphlet against the German Christians, *Theologische Existenz heute* (1933), did not amount to much more than an application of the Monroe doctrine to his quietist type of theology. Meanwhile the people perish.

The 'German Christians' are the bastard sons of the old liberals. Many of their supporters in 1933 were simply keen Christians anxious to bring the Church more closely into touch with the life of the people. But these have dropped off since the extremists took the lead under the aegis of the 'S. A. Bishop' Müller, who for two years has nominally directed the newly united Church of the Reich. The chief forces behind this perverted modernism would seem to be anti-semitism and a desire to apply the '*Führer prinzip*' and '*Gleichschaltung*' to the Church—with a subservience to the Nazi state which would have left Erastus aghast! On the question of the 'Aryan paragraph,' excluding Jews from the Church, the 'Confessionals'—as the die-hard Evangelicals now style themselves—have bravely held their ground.

One of their leaders in this struggle against the German Christians is the ex-submarine commander Niemöller. His sermon at Dahlem on September 8th consisted of a violent attack on 'positive Christianity.' Now although Göring has lately repeated the Government's intention to keep out, as far as possible, of the religious dispute, this 'positive Christianity'—in contrast to the 'negative' Christianity of creeds and confessions—is publicly sponsored by several members of the Government, among them Kerrl and Rosenberg. And, although the German Christians behind Müller are losing ground, 'positive Christianity' is in the ascendant. Rosenberg's book *The Myth of the Twentieth Century* comes second only to *Mein Kampf* on the Nazis' book-list. It is the religious counterpart of their political bible, and its title is appropriate enough. For it seeks to rehabilitate the 'Aryan Jesus' of Houston Stuart Chamberlain. Not scorning to take evidence from the Talmud passage which calls Jesus the son of Pantheras, he argues that this must be the Roman soldier of that name, whose inscription has conveniently turned up at Bingerbrück on the Rhine, and who saw service in Syria! Rosenberg still calls himself a member of the Church, but for him 'not Palestine, but Germany is the Holy Land,' and 'the idea of national honour comes before brotherly love.' The

Jesus whom he admires is 'the impetuous preacher who stormed in the Temple . . . not the sacrificial Lamb of Jewish prophecy, not the crucified.' 'Turning the other cheek is a feminine exaggeration, not to be found in Mark,' and 'the final criterion' of conduct is 'the race-bound national soul.'

More intelligent, and more honest, is the position of the 'German Faith Movement,' a federation of various groups who have broken with the Church altogether. The career of their leader, Professor J. W. Hauer, is in many ways typical. The son of a Swabian cobbler, he was attracted as a youth by the fervour of the Hahnian pietists and spent some five years as a missionary in India. There he became interested in Hinduism, and left to study at Edinburgh and Oxford. His First in Greats came with the War, during the early part of which he wrote books on Yoga as an interned prisoner. After returning to Germany as an army chaplain, he became a lecturer in comparative religion at Marburg, and leader of the Köngener Bund, a Liberal Christian Branch of the Youth Movement. But his thought soon overflowed the narrow confines of Lutheranism, and as Professor of Sanskrit in Tübingen he left the Church and devoted himself to 'die Kommende Gemeinde,'[1] a society formed to promote an undogmatic religion based largely on Indian and German philosophy. In 1933 he was called to be President, and in 1934 sole Führer, of the '*Deutsche Glaubensbewegung*,' a fusion of many pagan groups, but not the extremist Tannenberg league of Frau Ludendorff (which has been nominally suppressed), and no longer the 'Nordic Religious Society,' which objected to the inclusion of 'half-Christians' and former social-democratic free-thinkers. In fact, the more moderate sections in this Aryan hotch-potch have come to the top: it is this which makes it such a real menace to Christianity.

Hauer's general position may be described as a firm belief in the Immanence of the transcendent God; in short, as a 'higher' or 'graded' Pantheism. In many respects it recalls that of the loftier Stoics, Cleanthes and Marcus Aurelius. The noble paganism of Julian, too, is more than a nominal parallel. Ethically, Hauer does not stand far from Christianity; in the fifth chapter of his book *Deutsche Gottschau* (1934) he stresses the need of self-sacrifice (of which Jesus is *an* example) and in-

[1] 'The Coming Community'—in contrast to Lutheran individualism.

culcates 'reverence for Life, Property, Truth, Law and Love' —though here he points out that for him Love must be more for the strong and healthy than for the weak. He looks for the soldierly virtues rather than meekness and anything that savours of the preservation of the unfittest. Brynhilda, Gudrun and Diotima (p. 132) are his ideals of womanhood. Theologically, he accepts many of the terms of orthodox Christianity. He speaks with reverence of the experience of 'eternal reality' as 'a loving Father.' But he has a horror of committing himself to any cut-and-dried metaphysic: the 'presumptuous complacency' with which the ultimate essence of God is often described as personal, he finds an 'impious and ungodly procedure' (p. 218).

Had Hauer's career continued to lie in England, he might well have been a contributor to such papers as the *Modern Churchman*. He is a striking instance of the desire to make that difficult combination of free (but reasonable) thought with deep religious feeling, and one feels that it is through the force of circumstances rather than from any inherent propensity that he has thrown up his allegiance to Christ. On pp. 251-2 of *Deutsche Gottschau* he still speaks reverently of Jesus: 'None can meet him without being seized with admiration for his heroic greatness, for his unexampled power of love, and the readiness to sacrifice himself for his work. . . . Many of his words and deeds can stir us Germans to the bottom of our souls. . . . But foreign to us are his belief in the devil, in the Last Judgment and everlasting damnation, and in his own return on the clouds of Heaven to admit none but redeemed sinners into the Kingdom of God, and the Christian's faith that He alone was the Way and the Truth and the Life.' For the fact is (although Hauer will not rule out 'the possibility of his Aryan birth') 'his character does not correspond with the German soul. . . . For, however hard it may sound to many ears, the question of Jesus is *not* a vital problem to the youth of Germany.' For it is impossible, he thinks, to rescue Jesus from his Jewish trappings, notably the concept of expiatory sacrifice and of original sin, with which his Indo-Germanic Faith is in sharpest conflict.

Now it is noticeable that, although Hauer gives a much more recognizable picture of Jesus than does Rosenberg, most of the 'semitic' sentiments which he quotes with disapproval from the Gospels, come from the Judaistic matter which is peculiar to

the First Gospel and whose authenticity is widely called in question. And we at least can be thankful that outside Germany there are many Christians who do *not* regard Christ's death as a vicarious propitiation, and for whom many other of Hauer's stumbling-blocks do not exist: but for whom, on the other hand, national honour and race do *not* come before brotherly love. St. Paul probably held few of the doctrines for which he is castigated by Rosenberg, and in any case none of them, except the central core of a*gape* (love), were essential to his Christian experience. And one wonders hopefully whether Germany may not yet evolve a Christianity which really meets her special needs. Possibly this may yet come from the less extremist Confessionals and German Christians, and the still larger body of 'neutrals' in the Protestant Church, while the social zeal and the nature-mysticism of Rittelmeyer's *Christengemeinschaft*, and the obtrusive internationalism of the Group Movement, may each have their contribution to make: but above all there is a call for sober scholarship and sane thinking. One cannot but admire the tactful and yet dogged resistance unexpectedly put up by the Confessional pastors against absolutist racialism and the Erastian tendencies of the totalitarian state. But the day of Christianity will not come until the Churches abandon some of *their* claims to absoluteness, and take down the shutters over their windows to let the daylight from outside stream in, and in their turn show the benighted pagans the light, not of an incomprehensible faith or outworn creeds, but of God's true gospel for the modern world. Persecution has undoubtedly given fresh life to the Church; but the life that is born of persecution is often more hectic than healthy. It is the more encouraging to note (1) a real, if intermittent, desire to come to terms with the Evangelicals on the part of the new Minister for Church Affairs, Herr Kerrl, and (2) the fact that some of the intelligent opposition to the excesses of Nazism is rallying round the Church as a last bulwark against tyranny. The influx of these intellectuals may serve to broaden the minds of the ecclesiastics as well as to give them courage. Lastly, we must not forget that in Roman Catholicism (always provided that nothing drastic happens to 'the helpless old man in the Vatican') the young totalitarian State is up against an old-established totalitarian Church. And the battle will go to the strong.

THE JUBILEE OF MARK PATTISON'S 'MEMOIRS'

MARK Pattison—whose *Memoirs* were published by his widow just fifty years ago—was born at Hornby in the North Riding of Yorkshire on the 10th October, 1813. His father was curate-in-charge there, and subsequently became vicar of Hawkswell, where Mark spent his boyhood. He was the eldest of ten children, the youngest being Dorothy Wyndlow, better known as Sister Dora. Familiarly described as 'a little ray of sunshine'—an epithet never applied to her brother—she was a woman of naturally exuberant spirits, of deep religious feeling, and endowed with great powers of work. She did heroic work among the poor and unfortunate at Walsall, especially in small-pox cases. After her early death in 1878, she was commemorated by a statue in the market-place. Her brother writes of her in the *Memoirs* (61):

> 'She spent a faculty of invention, which would have placed her in the first rank as a novelist, in embellishing the everyday occurrences of her own life.'

Meeting her after many years' separation his greeting was, 'What, Dora, still cutting off little Tommy's fingers and little Jenny's toes?'

Pattison went up to Oriel in 1832, took his B.A. in 1836 and M.A. in 1840. He had by this time fallen under the influence of Newman, and helped him in the translation of Thomas Aquinas's *Catena Aurea* on the Gospels. He also wrote the lives of Stephen Langton and St. Edmund for a series called *Lives of the English Saints*. After standing unsuccessfully for fellowships at Oriel, University and Balliol, he was elected to a fellowship at Lincoln in 1839. His devoted work as a college tutor, his influence on first his pupils and then the college generally seemed to entitle him to succeed to the Rectorship of Lincoln on the death of Dr. Radford, in 1851. Owing to a discreditable intrigue another was elected. This downfall of his hopes and ambitions, not so much for himself as for the college in which his whole heart was sunk, made him a soured and disappointed man. This bitterness is all too apparent in the

Memoirs penned thirty years afterwards.

However, in 1861 he was made Rector, and retained the office till his death. In 1878 he 'had the moral courage to refuse' the Vice-Chancellorship. Since 1851 he 'lived wholly for study,' adding with characteristic bitterness:

> 'in a University ostensibly endowed for the cultivation of science and letters such a life is hardly regarded as a creditable one.'

In 1861 he married at Iffley Church Emilia Frances Strong, who afterwards became the wife of Sir Charles Dilke. His health broke down completely in November 1883. In June of the next year he was removed to Harrogate, where he died of cancer on the 30th July. He was buried in the churchyard at Harlow Hill near by.

The obituary notices were kindly, the *Academy* being especially sympathetic. The *Times* concluded a long and laudatory account with a quotation from Pattison's own words on the death of Scaliger:

> 'The aspiring spirit ascended before the Infinite. The most richly stored intellect which ever spent itself in acquiring knowledge was in the presence of the Omniscient.'

When the *Memoirs* appeared there was, however, much criticism. The *Times* had two long notices, but they were for the most part a summary of the work itself. There is, however, one interesting paragraph. Pattison (Ib, 189) states that:

> 'Pusey had told a fact about myself got from me (in confession) to a friend of his who employed it to annoy me.'

The *Times* comment is:

> 'He volunteered confession to Pusey, with the very natural result that when he came to wage war against clericalism, ecclesiasticism, pietism and all the 'isms something he had confessed leaked out and was urged against him.'

The *Saturday Review*, to whose columns he had been a valued contributor, wrote on his death:

> 'It may be said with deliberation and without fear of contradiction that in Mr. Mark Pattison the University of Oxford has lost by far the most distinguished of her resident members.'

It then refers to this 'thoroughly ill-tempered book,' and is, as might be expected, especially severe upon the 'Tractarian' pages. Still, it concludes the review with:

> 'Mr. Pattison was emphatically a great scholar. Perhaps, indeed, he was the last specimen of one great kind of scholar that this generation, and not a few generations to come, will see.'

Both the *Athenaeum* and the *Academy* in their notices regret the inclusion of the unpleasing and unedifying account of the election to the headship. Speaking of the book as a whole, the latter journal says :

> 'It is a sincere self-revelation, and has all the deep pathos and interest which attaches to such a record . . . he has not spared his own faults : it is to be wished he had spared those of others.'

The reviewer, H. Nettleship, finishes with the words :

> 'It is the picture of a beautiful soul, marred by self-inflicted wounds, but constant and undaunted in its struggle towards the light.'

Two interesting reminiscences appeared in *Temple Bar* in 1885. One was by a scholarship candidate who met Pattison when he was 64. The article places him in a very pleasing light, and records his cordiality, his refreshing interest, his kindliness and sympathy . . . 'the Rector of Lincoln was like an oyster —hard to open, but delicious when you had opened him.' The writer was asked by Pattison how he could get to know the undergraduates better ; how to meet them and to take an interest in their athletics. Though fond of riding and fishing, the modern passion for athletics filled him with disgust. He played croquet —as Shrimpton's caricature bears evidence—and was fond of lawn tennis even in advancing years, though, if report be true, he was a bad loser.

Another article in the same periodical places him in a very different light. According to this writer he suffered from the lack of a public-school training ; he was morbid, introspective and lacking in love and generous sympathy. His hide-bound egotism prevented him from ever showing a spontaneity of admiration. Pattison was a 'tyke.'

His friend, J. Cotter Morison, in his *In Memoriam* which appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine* for October 1884, was most enthusiastic. Pattison is hailed both as a friend of learning and a hater of clericalism. His only criticism is that he 'not wholly to his credit' should have succumbed—for a time at any rate—'to the magic charm of the English Bossuet.'

Bacon himself was not filled with a warmer zeal for the advancement of learning than the Rector of Lincoln. He valued knowledge too highly to make a trade of it, even if paid only in fame ; he could never be a business author with one eye on his

subject, and the other on his market. His life was the life of a scholar not in the modest sense in which the word is often used of men who skim lightly over a vast surface of literary knowledge, but in the sense in which it was understood a century and a half ago by the great students of European reputation. His ideals of what a college should be are best expressed in his *Suggestions on Academical Organization* (1868), and in an article *What is a College?* which appeared in the *Journal of Education*, March, 1882. After a definition of the Latin *Collegium* he briefly traces its history throughout the ages, and arrives at the conclusion that the object of a college was study, not teaching. Gradually, however, there came students who were willing to pay handsomely for board and tuition. They came first to learn the elements — *pensionarii*. He deplores the reforms of 1854, which, though much needed, went too far in an opposite direction. The sudden withdrawal of all reverence for the past, and the fetish of examinations 'has generated a type of intellect which is not only offensive to taste but unsound as learning.' Elementary education has gradually become the sole object of college residents. Competitive exercises, and the training for prizes has become the main end of a University. The spiritual vocation of teaching and guiding the student in the paths of science, and the function of the colleges as conservators of ancient learning has dropped out of sight. To an eager student the Rector once said :

> 'You have come up to Oxford with the idea of getting knowledge. You must give up that at once. We have bought you, and are running you for two plates.'

Pattison's literary output — not taking into consideration articles in periodicals and reviews — is comparatively small. The wonder is, not that he wrote so little, as that he wrote so much as he did. This is due to the high standard he set himself, and to his fastidious attention to meticulous accuracy. He never wrote because he had to say something, but because he had something to say. He loved learning for the joy of acquiring it — an intellectual miser, someone once called him. How high his standard was of the requirements of a literary life can be seen from some reminiscences by a friend :

> 'He suggested I should edit Selden's *Table Talk*. The preparation

> was to be, first to get the contents practically by heart, then to read the whole printed literature of Selden's day, and of the generation before him. In twenty years he promised me that I should be prepared for the work.'

From reading the *Ephemerides* of Isaac Casaubon, published in 1851, he contemplated a history of learning from the Renaissance downwards, but he soon found this scheme too extensive and contracted his views to the history of classical learning. Of this plan he executed only fragments. In 1865 he contemplated writing the life of Scaliger — whom he resembled in his hatred of shams, and his love of learning and truth. The appearance of Bernay's *Joseph Justus Scaliger* induced him to lay it aside, and all we have is an article in the *Quarterly*, and three fragments published after his death in his *Essays*, edited by his friend, Henry Nettleship.

He contributed valuable essays putting forth his views on University reform and ideals, and wrote numerous articles for the *Quarterly*, *Westminster* and *Saturday*, and other reviews. He was the editor of Pope's *Essay on Man*, Milton's *Sonnets* and other works. In 1875 his most important work appeared. *Isaac Casaubon* — a biography of a scholar by a scholar.

Pattison had come up to Oxford from a Puritan home where religion had been narrowed almost to two points — fear of God's wrath and faith in the Atonement. In 1832 Oriel was past its prime; the days of the Noetics were over, and Tractarianism had not yet arisen. Hawkins had got rid of Newman and Hurrell Froude as tutors. In 1834, however, Newman was Dean, and Pattison's rooms were opposite to his. Hurrell Froude he got to know almost at once, but it was not till about 1838 that he was drawn into the vortex of Tractarianism. Newman was a good tutor, and regarded his office as a pastoral one. He had high and lofty conceptions of what a University should be, but even in 1830 religion was not only the first, but the sole object of all teaching. Though impressed by Newman, Pattison was still so far from being influenced by him that he openly and ostentatiously took the side of Hampden in the matter of the Regius Professor of Divinity.

His failure to get a fellowship in 1838 turned his thoughts to Orders in 1839. In 1845 he obtained a tutorship at the col-

lege, which meant a great deal of hard work and gave him a serious object in life. He records (Ib, 187):

> 'I think it was chiefly owing to this that when the crash came in 1845 I did not follow Newman.'

The next twenty pages are occupied with copious extracts from his diary giving details of his life, and an analysis of his feelings while at Littlemore. His comment on this period on looking back (Ib, 189) is:

> 'I see a good deal of degrading superstition, of fasting and attending endless religious services . . . of reciting the Hours of the *Roman Breviary*, and seemed to please myself for some time in this time-wasting and mind-drowning occupation.'

In 1843 there was no change of feeling for some time, but he observes that the fanatical instincts did not gain ground but remained at a dead level. He thinks in 1847 (two years after Newman's secession) he might have dropped off in some moment of mental and physical depression or under the pressure of some arguing convert. His work as a tutor and his success as an examiner surprised him, and Tractarianism gradually left him. As the years went on he became less and less influenced by theological opinions.

He met Newman casually in a train some years later, but they were not to meet again till Pattison was on his death-bed. Told of his old friend's grave state by a common acquaintance, Newman wrote on December 27th, 1883:

> 'My very dear Pattison—I grieve to hear that you are very unwell . . . Is there any way in which I can serve you? At least I can give you my prayers, such as they are.
>
> Yours affectionately,
>
> John H. Card. Newman.'

Pattison wrote the next day:

> 'When your letter, my dear master, was brought to my bedside this morning, and I saw your well-known handwriting, my eyes filled so with tears that I could not at first see to read what you had said.

And concluded:

> 'Let me subscribe myself for the last time,
>
> Your affectionate son and pupil,
>
> Mark Pattison.'

Some further correspondence ensued, as the Cardinal was anxious for an interview. The sick man hesitated, fearing the emotion and perhaps great pain it would cause. Newman was however very insistent, and the two old men met on January 9th,

1884. What exactly happened Newman never disclosed, but what little he did say was expressive of satisfaction.

In 1860 Pattison contributed a paper on *Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688—1750*, to *Essays and Reviews*. Learned, temperate, and impartial, it failed to please either the *Westminster Review* or the *Guardian*, as it was written neither for or against one of the parties in the Church. Pattison says the study of the sources and the collection of the materials occupied him for nearly two years. An interleaved copy preserved in the Bodleian is eloquent evidence of the meticulous care he bestowed upon any piece of work he undertook.

George Eliot is supposed to have drawn the character of Mr. Casaubon in *Middlemarch* from the Rector. There is, however, little in common with a brilliant scholar like Pattison and the dreary pedant filtering away his life in useless and futile trivialities. An offensive caricature as the miserly curmudgeon, Professor Forth, in Rhoda Broughton's *Belinda* caused the hitherto hospitable gates of Lincoln to be closed upon the authoress. Mrs. Humphry Ward in her *Life* states that Roger Wendover in *Robert Elsmere* is in many ways a portraiture of Pattison. Parallels to his caustic and cynical utterances can be found in the *Memoirs*, and so can much of the conversation of Edward Langham in the same novel.

Towards the last he suffered much from pain and depression :

> 'I can't read even a trashy novel. I am not free from physical suffering for five minutes in the twenty-four hours, and all I want is to get back to Oxford and die in my own bed.'

Yet he can write (xvi, 332) :

> 'On this very day — New Year's Eve, 1884 — I can read Sophocles with greater delight than I ever did.'

He once asked Lionel Tollemache : 'Shall I have my library in heaven?' In his Sermons he insists strongly upon personal immortality, and in two (University Sermon IV and College Sermon II) suggests the idea that intellectual progress is a means of fitting ourselves for that life as well as personal goodness.

It is very difficult to say what his religious views were in his later years. He himself says : 'Religion is a good servant, but a bad master.' In the concluding chapter of the *Memoirs*, he writes :

> 'I seemed to my friends to have changed, to have gone over from High Anglicanism to Latitudinarianism, or Rationalism or Unbelief. This is not so; what took place with me was simple expansion of knowledge and ideas.'

He then goes on to trace the change from his home Puritanism to Catholicism, and from thence to the final phase (Ib, 328):

> 'Thus Catholicism dropped off me as another husk which I had outgrown. There was no conversion or change of view; I could no more have helped what took place within me than I could have helped becoming ten years older.'

Dr. Rashdall (*Life*, p. 226) in a letter says:

> 'He would be a bold man who attempted to say what M. Pattison's theological opinions were in his later years. He went on celebrating in the College Chapel to the end . . . His *Memoirs* certainly suggest a lack of sympathy not only with orthodoxy, but with any very definite form of Christianity.'

The writer of the Obituary in the *Academy* says that he clung with a singular tenacity to the duty of officiating at Holy Communion, and when absent from Oxford would make a point of returning at considerable personal inconvenience.

That Pattison was harsh, unjust and at times ferocious was true; that as the *Memoirs* show he cherished grudges and allowed himself to be embittered by events which had occurred thirty years ago, is also true. But it must be remembered that his father and his home-life were in many ways rigorous. We have but to recall the home-life of Haworth Parsonage. He came to Oxford an eager student—'gladly wolde he lerne'—and found that study was the last thing his fellow-undergraduates thought of. Later on as a tutor would he 'gladly teche'—and found himself surrounded by men who were satisfied with such a meagre routine of lectures as was absolutely necessary for the retention of their posts. In religion and theology he made men think clearly and probe things to their depth. In his ideal of the life of study, both for teacher and taught, the true learner finds in learning its own exceeding great reward. His best epitaph is found in his own words (Ib, 1):

> 'All my energy was directed upon one end—to improve myself, to form my own mind, to sound things thoroughly, and to free myself from the bondage of unreason, and the traditional prejudices which, when I began first to think, constituted the whole of my intellectual fabric . . . If there is anything of interest in my story, it is as a story of mental development.'

A. M. Coleman.

THE DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM OF KARL MARX

By Archibald Chisholm, D.D.

THE Kingdom of God is coming. The folly of one generation may destroy the harvest of a century of earnest endeavour, but the collapse is only temporary. The world is in God's hands, and through the age-long process there is being achieved 'one increasing purpose.' Dark eras descend upon the soul of man, when it is hard to discover outward evidence of anything but chaos resulting from human incapacity, but faith asserts that the victory is certain. Augustine ends his *De Civitate Dei* by predicting the eternal felicity of the City which is from above; and in this he is true to the faith of the New Testament; without such a conviction the Church would lose its hope. The Christian discovers in the teaching of the New Testament certain principles which constitute the vertebral column of the Universe. He strives to act in accordance with these guiding principles believing that he is obeying the Divine Will. Thus he discovers a certain invulnerability in the presence of criticism and opposition. A faith of a similar nature carried to speedy triumph the cause of Mohammed. Mohammedans believe that behind all events there is manifest the working out of an eternal purpose; though their fatalistic teaching does not absolutely eliminate free-will, the all-significant factor is the divine appointment (qad a): and the word 'Islam' indicates the attitude of submission to this purpose. The actions of men fall into the framework of the eternal decrees, and by a system of pre-established harmony the individual action becomes an instrument of the Divine purpose.

It is possible that some great movement may reach its triumph without such a confidence, but as yet this has not happened. The nearest approach to such an event is the speedy and partial success of Communism, but though the followers of Marx have no religious faith, they have certain beliefs which provide them with the conviction that the ends they are striving to secure are predestined. They believe that the task in which

they are engaged is not that of building up human society according to some pattern which they have devised as a result of careful thought; they assert that the form of the society adumbrated is not merely a new fabric which is capable of promoting human well-being. The new Society to the Marxian, like the 'City of God' to the Christian, is the one and only form of society which is destined to emerge from the chaos of the present, and the developments of the future. If Marx and Lenin had been only political leaders, they could never have impressed their views on a nation. Marx was a Hosea, far more than he was an Adam Smith; Lenin was more a Luther than he was a Bismarck; but their prophecies claimed no higher authority than the cumulative wisdom of the ages.

In order to maintain the spirit of determination whereby policies adopted may be carried through to their termination, Marx provided for his followers the doctrine of 'Dialectical Materialism.' There are two reasons why it is so called. First of all it is based on a refusal to admit the existence of any divine power, and secondly it derives its origin from a logical process which, from the time of Hegel, has been known as dialectic. Yet the theories advanced by Marx diverged greatly from the teaching of the philosopher from which he borrowed so greatly. Hegel's teaching dealt a death-blow to the thought that the accepted ideas of his time possessed finality; truth lay not so much in the products of man's thinking, but rather in the process of cognition itself. The conclusions reached were in accord with religious belief; when Hegel's wife questioned him regarding immortality, he pointed to the Bible; his teaching lent support to ancient beliefs and he endeavoured to clothe his philosophy in the language of religion.

During his lifetime his influence was supreme, but when he died in 1831, there came to younger philosophers a sense of freedom similar to that which the younger theologians felt when Schleiermacher died two years later. Though Hegelianism reigned exclusively until about 1840, its supporters were divided. Headed by Bruno Bauer, the philosophers of the left endeavoured to draw atheistic and revolutionary conclusions from Hegel's philosophy. Indeed much of their writing seems to have been clothed in philosophic language in order that thereby

the ideas promulgated might escape the rigid censorship which would have been applied to them if their publications had been issued as political pamphlets.

The line of development from Hegel to Karl Marx is not to be traced through these Hegelians of the left, who at an early stage adopted a viewpoint which was materialistic and revolutionary, but rather through Feuerbach. At the age of eighteen, Feuerbach was deeply interested in questions relating to Christian ethics. As a young man he desired to enter the ministry and studied at Heidelberg, where he fell under the influence of an unmitigated Rationalism which tended to make it seem as though the Bible were fabulous, and after attending a few lectures delivered by Hegel, he determined not to enter the Church. He applied his mind, which was always disinterestedly searching for truth, to metaphysics and philosophy. He admitted to Marx and Engels that he was communistic in his sympathies, but he would not join their movement. He desired religious reform and was eager not to destroy Christianity without replacing it. His viewpoint was essentially the viewpoint of the Humanist of our day, and although he came to deny the existence of any supernatural powers, his system was idealistic rather than materialistic. The conclusion of his teaching, namely, that the idea of God is simply the product of the human mind and that all theology is anthropology, made it easy for Marx and Engels to depart from Idealism and to become supporters of the materialistic standpoint. Thus they were left with the task of supporting their communistic doctrines on some foundation other than the Idealism of Hegel or Feuerbach, and they discovered that the dialectic of Hegel was capable of being adapted to this end.

Hegel sought to show that contradiction was the law of life and used various illustrations in order to familiarize his readers with the idea. In electricity we have the positive and the negative; similarly in the world of material objects there is repulsion and attraction. Atoms move in opposite directions and thus a tension is created, but if for a moment the atoms associated with a chair were to move in the same direction, the chair would become non-existent. Any solid object maintains its existence, solely because of the constant tension which is at work. The

notion comprises within it contradictory elements, namely, the *thesis* and the *antithesis*, and these pass on to the stage of *synthesis* when contradictions are reconciled and the notion becomes completely conscious of itself. Hegel also showed how the law of contradiction operated in morality, the law of life. If you take any right and drive this abstract right to an extreme degree, that which you claim as a right involves injury to someone else; *summum jus summa injuria.*

Feuerbach employs freely the Hegelian dialectic. Part I of his *Essence of Christianity* consists of nine chapters and seven of these in their structure are definitely Hegelian. The contradictions in the doctrine of God, in the Trinity and in the Sacraments are displayed with an acumen not unlike that of which Kant gives evidence in his treatment of the antinomies, and Marx and Engels, who had since 1845 gone beyond the Idealism of Feuerbach, examined afresh the possibilities of the dialectical method. It would, of course, be wrong to assume that the aims of their reforming activities were guided by these considerations. Revolutionary thought in Europe tended to run along certain lines. The dialectical method was capable of being used as a philosophical defence of the ideas for which Marx and his friends stood. They discovered that the world in which they lived was divided by the class struggle, and in this class struggle they saw the tension already referred to. The existence of classes, Marx asserted, was a phase in a great world movement which could have only one climax. The class struggle must of necessity lead to the dictatorship of the proletariat, but even this attainment on the part of the workers could not in itself provide a terminus for the great world movement. The dictatorship of the proletariat was only a stage, and contained within itself the germ of something better. Here then is the process; first, the rule of the bourgeoisie, then the dictatorship of the proletariat, and after that a society without class.

In the elaboration of this thesis, there are many arguments which require careful examination. As outlined by Marx, the doctrine of Dialectical Materialism is based on three laws and contains sixteen elements, but the significant thing for those who believe that the ultimate results of human striving will be the realization of the Kingdom of God, is that Marxism looks be-

yond the dictatorship of the proletariat. In so far as this has been achieved, or is likely to be more fully achieved, though it has dealt a drastic blow to the many great inequalities which persist in non-communistic lands, it is frankly admitted to be only a stage. The dialectic, as has been frequently shown, is a weak foundation on which to support any political edifice; it is arbitrary in its interpretation of past history, and is by no means capable of sustaining the philosophical structure erected upon it, but its declaration that beyond existing conditions there is a more adequate stage is very significant.

No real thought has been given by the Marxians to the outlining of the details of that final scheme of society; and long ere the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat has passed, Russia may have departed from the Materialism imposed upon her by the powerful minority which now controls the destiny of that deeply religious people, for whom the era of godlessness must inevitably be a passing phase. When the time comes it may not be difficult to transform an industrial system, across which is written the Marxian motto, '*From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs*,' until it becomes in accord with the ideals of the Kingdom of God. Though the process has been a costly one, it may well be that the heart of the Russia of to-morrow will prove more hospitable to Christian ideals than if the people of that great land had been left to develop gradually from the pre-revolutionary conditions under which so many gross injustices were permitted and at times sanctioned, by those who stood before the people as heralds of the Kingdom of God.

Though the dialectic of Marxism may become intellectually discredited, the Materialism with which it is associated requires to be subjected to careful analysis. It owes much to the teaching of Feuerbach, who in a very attractive form developed a thesis which was not unknown to the Romans of the first century B.C. In the six books of *De Rerum Natura*, Lucretius asserted that religion was based on an illusion and that fear created the gods. Feuerbach regarded himself as an idealist, and was much more eager to provide a form of religion, devoid of what he regarded as the pagan elements which had been imposed on it, than to destroy the faith. Always interested in comparative religion, he

amassed a great amount of information regarding primitive beliefs. He held that in early times men found themselves confronted by strange things which they could not understand, and thus they came to believe in spectres. They explained these strange forms by saying they had come from another world and that the dead still lived. The doctrine of immortality provided for a certain need of the human soul; it helped men to accommodate themselves to the hard facts of an unkind world. Were it not for this belief, death would become an insupportable burden, crushing the heart of man. In order to face life, man invents the doctrine of a life to come. Even as he discovered the doctrine of immortality to be in some measure an expression of faith in the value of life, so Feuerbach regarded the belief in God as one form in which man asserted his own divinity. He compares man's religious thinking to the movement of the blood through the arteries; the blood which flows through our veins emerges from the heart and in time must return to the heart: the doctrine of God and of immortality is a sentiment born within our hearts which, for a time, objectifies itself in an exterior form, but finally returns. All theology is anthropology. Even as the doctrine of immortality meets a need of the human heart by bringing comfort in the hour of death, so the doctrine of God provides for similar needs. Like a spoiled child which always relies on the goodness of a father, humanity is unwilling to accept the hard facts of life.

This teaching of Feuerbach led to different reactions on the part of those who had fallen under his influence; and in Marx and Engels, it provoked further questions. The belief in God and immortality arises because man is weighed down by many trials and nevertheless desires to prolong life. This world is full of tragedy and disappointment, and men cannot realise their dreams here, but they fondly hope that in heaven the dream will be realized. Would men so resolutely cherish the belief in immortality or in God if they found this life more satisfying, or if they were able to realize in this world more of the ambitions which were dear to them? If instead of being confined by stern walls, beyond which he cannot go, man could realise his true nature, then man would be free from the necessity of inventing the comforting illusion of belief in God. From

this Marx went on to ask how man could be free from the bondage to which he is subjected. He attached an undue importance to the influence which material conditions exert on humanity. While it is true that for great numbers of people material conditions have a determining influence on their life and thought, this does not apply universally, but Marx asserted that if external conditions were improved, man could no longer have these deep longings. If we could make real on earth the happy state which theologians relegated to the heavens, then humanity would come into its own, and belief in God and immortality would disappear. Thus his revolutionary programme was designed to secure two ends. Not only would it free man from the tyranny of those who, in a capitalist world, controlled his destiny. It would also create a satisfaction with the present life whereby man would be freed from any longings after a life to come. 'The opiate of the people' would no longer disable man by providing him with some measure of comfort under unjust conditions. Man, knowing himself to be purely a creature of this world and not an heir of eternity, would resolutely apply himself to the task of improving conditions in this world.

This doctrine of God as a projection has, of course, been frequently subjected to careful criticism, and the main lines of criticism may be briefly recalled. The suggestion that the idea of God is introduced in order to provide for man's comfort in an inhospitable world neglects altogether the consideration that in so many religions and at so many periods of world history, the thought of God has been such as to have no comfortable associations. Animism does not render the world more comfortable for man; every tree becomes an object of terror and the world is filled with innumerable spirits which cause fear. Further, although the mystic life may be associated with forms of self-negation and mystics may be rightly described as ascetics who struggle against their desires, yet this explanation is inadequate. It may be admitted that these conditions of mind which we regard as abnormal lend greater tensity to the desire of God, but they can in no sense be regarded as accounting for this desire.

This close association between revolutionary political thought and atheistic beliefs was clearly discerned by Diderot in 1750.

> 'The cord which binds humanity is made of two strands; one cannot yield without the other breaking too. Once men have dared to assault the barrier of religion, which is at once the most formidable and the most respected that exists, there will be no stopping place. Once they have turned menacing eyes to the majesty of heaven, they will most certainly turn them next against the sovereignty of earth';

and if in the disturbing conditions of our day we desire to discover a method of promoting the lasting well-being of man, it will be necessary to ally to the zeal of the reformer the assured faith of the believer, or otherwise we shall be building a structure which cannot endure. We must welcome the removal of many things in modern society which are hostile to the complete development of the human spirit, and must recognize that the way of advance is along a pathway towards a predestined goal; but the goal is not marked out by the Marxian dialectic, and to support the soul of man in its search for a better order of society there is requisite such a faith as that on which Augustine and the seer of the *Apocalypse* relied.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE AGE OF ENLIGHTENMENT*

The eighteenth century was certainly one in which it would have been a pleasure to live, provided always that one was born to a decent competence, or had sufficient interest to obtain suitable preferment in Church or State. Seldom, perhaps, have the two terms been so nearly synonymous. 'In a Christian commonwealth,' said Burke, 'the Church and the State are one and the same thing, being different integral parts of the same whole.' Or as Tom Jones' tutor, that robust divine, the Rev. Mr. Thwackum, put it:

> 'When I say religion I mean the Christian religion, and when I say the Christian religion I mean the Protestant religion, and when I say the Protestant religion I mean the Church of England as established by law.'

Bishop Watson of Llandaff, of whom Dr. Sykes has given a most interesting account, could have conceived of the Church of England as Presbyterian or even as Unitarian, but a Church of England not established would have seemed to him almost a contradiction in terms.

Consequently when we say that the present volume, a reprint of the Birkbeck lectures in ecclesiastical history in 1931—1933, displays a profound knowledge of the Church life of the period under review, we imply that the author knows his eighteenth century thoroughly. His narrative leads us sometimes into the House of Lords or into the ante-chambers of the Duke

* *Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century.* By the Rev. Norman Sykes, M.A., D.Phil. (Cambridge University Press. 1934. Price 21/-.)

of Newcastle, the great bishop-maker of the reign of George II, and sometimes into the remote northern shires where poor scholars educated at Queen's College, Oxford, existed as curates on a pittance of thirty pounds a year or less, eked out in some cases by keeping a school, doctoring their parishioners, or drawing up wills in lonely dales where no attorney was within reach. Dr. Sykes' knowledge seems so intimate that he reminds us of the Oxford lecturer of whom it was said by a colleague, 'I believe, gentlemen, he could tell you what Prince Rupert had for breakfast on the morning of Marston Moor.'

Another qualification he possesses is sympathy. He is an apologist, albeit a candid and discriminating apologist, for the Georgian bishops. His book is a repressor of the over-much blaming of the clergy, particularly the superior clergy. He complains with justice that the Age of Enlightenment has 'suffered the singular misfortune to incur the censure of almost all schools of ecclesiastical historians.' Anglo-Catholics and Methodists are confederate against it and have conspired with the Radicals to blacken it. Assur also is joined with them and have holpen the children of Lot. And one reason for this prejudice is the fact that in the eighteenth century what we now call Modernism—they called it then Latitudinarianism—was largely dominant. Hence the Church of those days has been viewed through darkened spectacles. We can only hope that the reader of a hundred years hence will not get his notions of Bishop Barnes and Dean Inge from the columns of the *Church Times*.

Take one victim of this hostile tradition, Bishop Watson of Llandaff, 'a prelate of large and liberal spirit,' as Gibbon called him, thereby, of course, damning him in the eyes of the orthodox. Watson's liberality certainly went to great lengths. In his tract on the Expediency of Revising the Liturgy and Articles he wrote:

> 'Who will say that our posterity may not be as much astonished at our having believed the Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity, as we are astonished at our ancestors having believed the doctrine of Transubstantiation.'

He once declared that he did not expect much success in propagating Christianity by missionaries from any part of Christendom, but he expected much from the extension of science and commerce. After having held the office of Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge he was appointed to the Bishopric of Llandaff during the brief Whig administration of the Marquis of Rockingham. Llandaff was the Cinderella among the bishoprics; it was usually a stepping stone to an English see. Unhappily for Watson, the year after his appointment the Tories came in, and they stayed in except for very brief intervals till 1830. George II disliked Watson as a Whig and an opponent of the American War; moreover he disapproved of his Latitudinarian views; when his well-meant *Apology for the Bible* appeared, a reply to Tom Paine's *Age of Reason*, His Majesty observed drily that he wasn't aware that it needed any. We have often heard the story that the Bishop of Llandaff only once visited his see during the thirty-four years of his episcopate, on which occasion he delivered a spirited charge to his clergy on the evils of non-residence. We always thought the story too good to be true, and it appears from Dr. Sykes that Watson visited his diocese almost if not quite every year. 'In the extensive visitation of his diocese which he made in 1809 he went over the mountains from Neath to a place where no bishop had ever held a Confirmation before, Merthyr Tidvil.'

During the reigns of the first two Georges bishops were expected to support ministers in the House of Lords and to uphold the illustrious House of Hanover and the Protestant Succession. This duty obviously necessitated their residence in London during the winter months. Dr. Sykes proves by an impressive array of statistics that they travelled extensively in their dioceses, frequently on horseback, over the shocking roads of those times, and he quotes quite a romantic description of the hazards encountered by the intrepid Bishop of Bangor, in journeyings oft amid the savage mountains of North Wales.

Non-residence and nepotism, our author contends, were in no way peculiar to Georgian dignitaries; they were vain things received by tradition from their fathers of the Caroline and Jacobean Church. It would require a paragraph to enumerate the preferments held by the saintly Andrewes. 'If the centuries which are without sin in the matter of pluralism were alone allowed to cast stones at the Georgian Church, its reputation would not have suffered such severe dilapidation.'

We may, perhaps, add another reason not alleged by Dr. Sykes why the nineteenth and twentieth centuries should not assume too Pharisaical an attitude towards their ancestors. Of the eighteenth century Church it may fairly be said that we know the worst. Men spoke and wrote much more frankly then; biographies of bishops were much less mealy-mouthed than they have since become. So far as we know there is only one uncensored life of a Victorian ecclesiastic (we had almost added and only one that is worth reading), Purcell's *Life of Cardinal Manning*. In the eighteenth century a bishop made no bones about giving his son the best living in his gift. In the nineteenth century Bishop A promoted the son of Bishop B, who returned the compliment, and thus the proprieties were preserved. Possibly when the deflation of the Victorians initiated by Lytton Strachey has run its course, we may by comparison come to think more favourably of their predecessors.

We think that Dr. Sykes' Whig leanings make him less than fair to Atterbury's gallant but forlorn championship of the rights of Convocation, and particularly of its Lower House. Even Macaulay says that Atterbury was regarded by the great body of the clergy in the reign of Queen Anne as the ablest and most intrepid tribune that had ever defended their rights against the oligarchy of prelates. In this matter we have the honour to agree with Bishop Warburton, who applauded Atterbury, not merely because his adversaries, Gibson and Wake, were 'two of the dullest fellows in the world,' but because 'he went upon principles and all they could possibly oppose were precedents.' The virtual closing down of Convocation in 1717 was, when all is said, a real misfortune to the Church. The rebel presbyters, as Dr. Sykes calls them, were fighting, blindly perhaps and foolishly, against the tendency to make the Church a mere department of the State. And the State in the eighteenth century meant to all intents and purposes the aristocracy. The evil effects of the identification of the Church with the ruling classes were not fully seen till the democratic movement began in the last quarter of the century, when political reformers were almost forced into an anti-clerical attitude. But the alienation of the masses had begun long before and was largely responsible for the Methodist schism, the heaviest blow which the Church of England has ever sustained.

If we compare the Church of 1850 with that of 1750 we find a great increase of activity and perhaps a higher standard of clerical duty; but there is one ominous difference: the Church of England had ceased to be except in name the religion of the majority of the English nation. In the

growing industrial centres great numbers were out of touch with organised religion, and, speaking broadly, it was the Methodist Chapel rather than the Anglican Church which was the focus of the religious life of the working classes. In the eighteenth century, as Dr. Sykes has shown, if Communions were few, the majority of the people were communicants.

Professor Trevelyan in his *History of England under Queen Anne*, says that Dr. Norman Sykes is becoming the historian of the eighteenth century Church; it would be superfluous to add our own commendation. But it is a source of legitimate pride that he is a member of the Modern Churchmen's Union. We may point out two slips. On p. 147 and elsewhere he speaks of the Whig reforms of the 'third decade' of the nineteenth century; it should surely be the fourth. On p. 381 he calls Theophilus Lindsay Vicar of Cleveland. His father-in-law, Francis Blackburne, was Archdeacon of Cleveland; he himself was Vicar of Catterick. In the Parish Register of that Church there is an entry typical of the tolerant and gentlemanly age in which he had the good fortune to live:

> 'The Revd. Theophilus Lindsay Vicar of this place for ten years voluntarily resigned (not through infirmities of age, but out of a principle of conscience) Nov. 28, 1773. A Christian devout, learned and ingenuous and a great benefactor to ye place.'

GAMALIEL MILNER.

WHAT TO BELIEVE*

In his writings the Rev. J. C. Hardwick has shown both versatility and distinction, but there can be no doubt that this latest of them is the most important. Often their value has lain in the fact that they were acutely critical, and their charm in a delightful irony which some readers have not appreciated and so have confounded with cynicism. But of this last he says himself, 'This book is intended to be definitely constructive; merely to go on slaying the slain becomes wearisome.' And it is. The irony has not vanished, but been kept under stricter control; no reader has excuse for taking it as flippancy; the purpose is serious, and unmistakably so.

The fact is Mr. Hardwick has by this book taken his place in the succession of Justin Martyr and the other early Christian Apologists. Perhaps some who read *A Professional Christian* may exclaim 'Is Saul also among the prophets?' Let us forget that the authorship is the same, and recognise that while the novel was thrown off as the expression of a mood, the present work is the expression of the author's serious mind, and the outcome of many years' thought and study.

The book is indeed a valuable ἀπολογία for Christianity addressed to the mind of to-day. It is not apologetic in the current sense of the term, for the author is convinced that Christianity requires no excuse, and does not need to be defended if only it is understood. And he sees that what is wanted is not another exposition based on premises and habitudes of mind once generally acceptable, but obsolete and perhaps incredible to-day; rather it is one which gains access to many minds which are so much under the influence of prevalent conceptions as to be impervious to appeals which earlier generations found cogent. 'Leave the dead to bury their own dead, but go thou and publish abroad the Kinghood of God to the people actually met in the street,' is a commission Mr. Hardwick has heard, and which he braces himself to undertake. He has always been a thoroughgoing Modernist, sensitive to the religious (and irreligious) changes around

* *What to Believe.* By J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc. (Simpkin Marshall. 1935. Price 7/6.)

him, and eager to share the wider horizons which science and research have opened out to the last two generations. So rapid have these changes and acquirements been that anyone who has kept himself abreast of them must feel the instability of outlook in the world to-day, and the widespread hesitancy, if not incredulity, in its attitude to religion. For Mr. Hardwick the sense of this only brings out by contrast the stability of the spiritual facts and forces of life embodied in Christianity; but for shallower knowledge and less earnest minds the vague inference or feeling too often is that evidences of instability are so general that nothing assured is left. To this large class of people this book is fitted to appeal. Smatterers they may be in the sight of the best informed, who may be tempted to exclaim scornfully 'A little knowledge is a dangerous thing!' But then most of us are smatterers, and are bound to be, not possessing enough of either time or intellect to be much more. Is it a small service if a voice can reach the half-deaf ears and the dull intelligence of the man who is not much above the average, and commend to his heart and understanding the deep reality of religion?

Before mention of any particular points in this presentation of 'What to believe,' it is well to direct attention to two general features. The author's diagnosis of the chief obstacles to-day to religious apprehension, is that they are two:—The notion that 'the world and everything in it—Nature that is—is one vast machine,' which leaves little place for either God or personality in us; And the notion that 'the origins of Christianity were any *more* mysterious or miraculous than those of any other great spiritual movement.' Both these notions tend to an antithesis between what is met with in experience and recognised as real, and Christianity which is regarded as remote and wanting in reality. To gain admission to such a frame of mind, essentially vague but honest in its feeling of scepticism and disillusionment, two qualities are required, *viz.*, candour and moderation; and Mr. Hardwick has both. He never evades objections or shirks questions raised, but meets them fairly if he can, and, when he cannot, says frankly that he does not know. That inspires confidence in what he does reply. And he always prefers to understate rather than overstate his case. This both makes him more persuasive to those hitherto unconvinced, and also leads them to feel that such foundations as he lays are secure, even though they do not carry the superstructure that convinced Christians would often like to see built on them. This ought to be accounted to him for righteousness as an Apologist, though it is only too likely to arouse dissatisfaction in those many minds which cannot be content to remain with suspended judgment on disputable points where the evidence is insufficient for a verdict. Mr. Hardwick is himself deeply impressed by the mysteriousness of *all* life, and our inability to understand even the 'little flower in the crannied wall' without grasping the presence of God in all its greatness. And he both sees the inadequacy of the machine conception, and hates it.

> 'The Christian religion,' he says, 'with its emphasis upon the supreme value of the individual, is the potential wrecker of the machine idea. It can rescue man, give him a new self-respect, and a supreme contempt for mere bigness and power, which are the machine qualities.'

He is ready to urge with all his heart the counsel of ancient wisdom as a Modernist, 'Go to the ant thou sluggard, consider her ways and be wise enough to shun them at all costs, lest thou shouldest lose thy manhood, and sink to become a soulless cog in the social machine.'

The successive chapters (17) in this book deal with many of the most vital points in what to believe. In each there is independent treatment, but

as a whole they make a fairly full presentment of Christian theology, not as a dogmatic system, but as what will meet the needs of enquirers. Nor is practical religion absent if the implications of the teaching are taken into account, and homiletics are not looked for. Added value is given to the teaching by the fresh and unconventional turn so often met with.

For example, 'The doctrine of the Trinity is a departmentalization of God,' a statement which reflection justifies. This is elucidated by saying,

> 'What really separates our present outlook from that of the men who elaborated this doctrine, is that for us there is no longer any gulf between man and the rest of creation such as existed for them. Our modern theory of biological evolution has shown that man is himself a part of nature . . . We find no difficulty in believing that the creative God is present wherever there is creative activity; and if there is creative activity present in Jesus, then we should have no difficulty in saying that God was in him, not as the second "person" of the Trinity, but as the first "person," that is to say, as the creative God in His creative function, though this was actually a heresy in the early centuries.'

Similarly an arresting parallel is drawn between the Catholic Church and Marxism. 'In origin both alike were crystallizations of certain contemporary ideas around a vital and mystical conception, while in purpose both alike were offensive weapons with which to subdue a hostile world.' The subject of Miracle again is handled with wisdom and candour, justice being done both to the scientific and to the religious interest in it. Somewhat the same may be said of the treatment of the Fall, of the Resurrection, and of other subjects considered.

The difficult problem of Atonement receives a notable measure of light; it is indeed striking how much is here accomplished in some fifteen pages.

> 'In the first place religion always assumes that in reality the gulf between the actual and the ideal, man and God, a man's sinful self and his true self or the Christ within him, has been done away. The gulf is there; but from another point of view (anticipating things, so to speak) it is not there. It is not there for faith, because faith is "an outreaching of the mind beyond that which it immediately possesses" (Heb. ii, 1). For religious faith the gulf has already disappeared, and man is at one with God.'

This is not the whole solution of the problem, but it lays a most true foundation on which further stages of construction follow.

Enough has been quoted for illustration's sake; more must be sought in Mr. Hardwick's book. But one characteristic passage may be added in his answer to whether new religious truth is possible. After pointing out how and why inspiration died down in the second century, he continues:

> 'But in the eleventh century, and again the thirteenth, and yet again in the sixteenth, the Church found it possible to make room for new ideas, which it did in the first two instances with the adaptability of all vigorous organisms, though in the third instance it failed to avoid a disruption, from the results of which Christendom has not yet recovered. The present would appear to be another of those periods when an expansion is desirable, and it would be regrettable if this should not take place through the Church, and would be evidence that inspiration had passed from that body. The Churches are the natural laboratories for religion . . . But if we are afraid of inspiration lest it should lead us astray, inspiration becomes afraid of us lest we should stifle or corrupt it.'

E. P. Boys-Smith.

THE TWO EZEKIELS*

Some years ago our higher critics, notwithstanding the impassioned protests of traditionalists, succeeded in sawing Isaiah asunder. It was a truly painful proceeding, but is now generally recognized to have been really profitable. It has helped us greatly in understanding the Book of Isaiah. Driver, Smend, and other great Old Testament scholars and critics, were convinced that the Book of Ezekiel was a unity, composed by a single author, Ezekiel, who spent his early life in Judaea, in the declining years of that kingdom, which collapsed under the assault of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, and his later life as an exile in Mesopotamia. A priest-prophet, as was Jeremiah, he exercised a marvellous influence in preserving and purging the religion of the Judaean exiles, so that what had gone forth a decadent and defeated Kingdom returned a Church purged and promising. A body of German scholars, Cornill, Herrmann, Hölscher, and others have discredited this view. They have with much skill sawn Ezekiel asunder. They are as convinced that there were two Ezekiels as that there were two Isaiahs.

Dr. J. B. Harford in a scholarly book examines their arguments with judicial impartiality, remarkable lucidity, and moderation, and has come to the conclusion that in the main they are right. There were two Ezekiels; the first a prophet who lived at Judaea, and condemned its moral iniquities and religious horrors in the period which followed the death of the godly Josiah at Megiddo, and a second Ezekiel, a priest-prophet of the Exile whose work was more positive than that of his predecessor. He provided inspiring ideals for the Restored Israel.

We cannot give here the argument for this conclusion. It is based upon linguistic and stylistic considerations. The heart and mind of the second Ezekiel does not appear to differ essentially from that of the first Ezekiel, but there are serious differences in their literary style. Dr. Harford writes of the second Ezekiel:

> 'There is a second, more of prophetic soul, who belongs to the period of the Captivity, and who dwells in Babylonia. He may have been a young disciple of the older man, and he imbibes much of his spirit. He may well have treasured up the recorded utterances of his master and woven them in with his own oracles to form the first edition of the book as we now have it. The glory of the God of Israel is that which overmasters his soul. The vision of the throne-chariot in Chapter I is his . . . He it is who depicts the ideal temple of the future.'

This second Ezekiel is like Jeremiah the priest in the prophet's mantle, and the visions of the restored community in the concluding nine chapters of the book are mainly from his hand.

Dr. Harford includes in his book two very valuable expositions of the phrases 'House of Israel,' and Adonai-Yahweh.

Professor Burkitt, who was to have written the introduction, was prevented from doing so by his sudden death. Every British student of Ezekiel will feel compelled to consult this work. It is the only critically up-to-date introduction to Ezekiel which we possess in English. The Commentary on Ezekiel in the International Critical Commentary has been long and eagrely expected, but Canon Harford's excellent book renders us less impatient.

H.D.A.M.

* *Studies in the Book of Ezekiel.* By J. B. Harford, D.D. (Cambridge University Press. 1935. Price 7/6.)

PETER STERRY*

'His common fame was, that his preaching was such as none or few could understand: which incensed my desire to have heard him, which I still mist, though I oft attempted it.' So wrote Richard Baxter of Peter Sterry when he had read a posthumous tract of his on Free-Will. Baxter was impressed by 'his sublime and philosophical notions,' but found it no wonder he was understood by few. For many years only certain students have known of Peter Sterry, and Professor Pinto places many of us in his debt by showing us one who was a star in the constellation of the Cambridge Platonists of the seventeenth century. Dr. Pinto gives half his book to a careful and suggestive biographical account of Sterry, his writings and his teaching. The Professor is possibly more successful in bringing out Sterry's literary affinities than in an appraisal of his achievement. The reader is, however, given the facts and can form his own judgment, and the second half of the book is devoted to many extracts, many of them short, from Sterry's own books and sermons.

Sterry entered Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in 1629, three years after Benjamin Whichcote and John Smith, the better known Platonists. He was elected to a fellowship in 1637 but appears to have soon given it up, probably because he could not conform to the official religious teaching of the University. He became Chaplain to Lord Brooke, who was killed five years later in the attack on Lichfield. Sterry was also associated with Sir Henry Vane, the younger, and became known as an Independent Preacher; he preached to the lawyers and squires of the Long Parliament, sermons 'full of mystical doctrine and lyrical eloquence,' which as one said were 'too high for this world and too low for the other.' In 1649 he was appointed Chaplain to the Council of State and was one of the group of Independent divines who became the leaders of the Church under the Protectorate. Dr. Inge has remarked that there was more culture among the Puritans than among the roystering cavaliers, and Sterry and Milton, not to mention others, were students, as Dr. Pinto observes, of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, and English Literature, admirers of Homer and Virgil, of Tasso and Spenser, while Sterry, who alludes frequently to painting, especially praises Titian and Van Dyck. Sterry did not approve of Catholics or Presbyterians, but his was no partisan mind and he preached with an outspokenness, not always acceptable, about the sinfulness of the civil conflict and the duty of peace, reconciliation and toleration. Neither this charity nor his Platonic temper, ever aware that the world passeth away and the lusts thereof, could save one so much involved in affairs of state from that defamation of character which was the common lot of all public men in those bitter days. It is good to record that Charles II granted him a pardon and he was able to live out his life in quietness near Richmond as Chaplain to Viscount Lisle. All his years, and not least these later ones, were blessed by a happy marriage, and he is not least attractive in his affectionate and solicitous letters to his family. He died in 1672.

F. D. Maurice has remarked that:

> 'Peter Sterry . . . is one of those men into whose writings few have looked seriously without carrying away some impressions which they would be sorry to lose.'

His surviving writings are mostly sermons; there is also a Discourse on the Freedom of the Will with a remarkable preface, printed in full by Dr.

* *Peter Sterry, Platonist and Puritan*, 1613—1672. By Professor Vivian de Sola Pinto. (Cambridge University Press. 1934. 12/6.)

Pinto. This last eloquently declares the love of God and persuasively pleads for a charity that is wide and deep. Sterry wrote a poetic prose full of imagery drawn from the Bible, from the ancient poets, and from nature. 'Divine Truth,' he says, 'is as a *Rose Tree* which, as it hath its beautiful and perfumed roses, so it hath *prickels* to guard those roses from rash and rude hands.' Here the imagery is simple; more often it is so abundant as to be in danger of obscuring more than illuminating the truth it seeks to declare. Nor is modern taste quite at ease with his free use of sexual imagery to portray religious truth—though Sterry could appeal to the Bible in his defence. His theology is in the Platonic tradition, and his interests, as in the case of others of that great tradition, are religious rather than theological. Humanist and Puritan, Christian and Platonist, he is seeking ever to declare those things 'which cannot be uttered,' to portray God and His ways in their beauty, to draw men's minds to things spiritual, and by his sweet reasonableness, and his abounding metaphor, by his eagerness and his sincerity he makes known 'a New World of Glories.' One passage must suffice to show his quality.

> 'Perhaps some one will say, Who is this that thus preacheth Love to the world? Is he himself a *Dove washt in Milk?* Far is he from pretending to the praise and perfections of that Spirit, the Bride of the heavenly Bridegroom, which sitteth in the Garden of Divine Purities, Sweetnesses, and Light, making her Beloved and his Companions to hear *her Voice,* while they return their esteem, affections, and admiration in Songs, saying to her, *Thy voice is pleasant, thy Face, thy Person is lovely.* No, the only character here is that of a *Voice in the Wilderness,* a Wilderness of many Deformities and Distractions within, as well as *without, Crying. Prepare ye the way of Divine Love, make streight paths* for it, by *bringing down every Mountain of Vanity and Pride,* by *filling up* the *Vallies* of *low, dejected, lost, despairing spirits.* He who thus cries to you too frequently, too deeply, hath pierc'd the side of this Love. . . .'

H. G. MULLINER.

CONTEMPORARY LIVING FAITHS*

This excellent survey of the world's religions is by the Professor of Comparative religion at Yale University. It is an attempt to summarize the content and practices of the religions men *now* live by, with some attention to the founder (if any) and history of the religions in question. Much of the material is the result of first hand information, for the author spent a good deal of time in the mission field.

The first chapter deals with primitive religions, and then there are general surveys of China, Japan, and India, followed by chapters on Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. There is a concluding chapter which is a general summary of world religions. There are two appendices, one of review questions and one of ample bibliography. There is a large index.

In China to-day there are five formal religions.

> '1. *Ju-chiao,* or "Scholar-teaching," referring to Confucianism. . . . 2. *Tao-chiao,* or "Way-teaching," referring to Taoism. . . . 3. *Fo-chiao,* or "Buddha-teaching." . . . 4. *Hui-hui-chiao,* or "Return-Teaching," referring to Islam. . . . 5. *Ya-chiao,* or "Jesus-teaching." . . . Giving the preponderance to Confucianism is after all

* *Faiths Men Live By.* By John Clark Archer. (Nelson. 1935. $3.)

an estimate. In general culture China is without doubt Confucian, but in religion she is Buddhist. Most Chinese, exclusive of the Moslems and the Christians, profess and practise *san-chiao,* or "three religions," that is, the *ju-fo-tao.* The average Chinese may be Confucian, Buddhist, and Taoist — and an "animist,' as well — without much sense of inconsistency. . . . This Chinese trait may be accounted for in part by their indifference to religion, and in part to toleration' (pp. 50-51).

In Japan, there is a revival in religious interests to-day. There has been a good deal of reconstruction in recent years. To a certain extent, this revival is political, but there are certainly spiritual aspects involved. To-day, three religions are officially recognized: Shinto, of which there are several forms, Buddhism, and Christianity. The Japanese are tolerant concerning religious questions. 'But while Shintoists, Buddhists, and Christians are usually mutually distinguishable, all must be loyal to the State, if they would share its *kwan-yo-sei,* or "tolerant generosity"' (p. 137).

India is not a unified state. She is more a collection of separate states, with varieties of climate, races, and cultures. She is the seat of a variety of religious enterprises.

'To generalise about India is not merely unwise; it is impossible. She is at once a museum and a laboratory, filled with exhibits and experimental elements illustrative of the whole range of historical and contemporary life and religion' (p. 166). India proper 'is the setting not only of Hinduism, but of Jainism and Sikhism. It was the first home of Buddhism, now found in Ceylon, Burma, China, and Japan — save for 300,000 Buddhists still in India' (p. 167).

There follow chapters on Hinduism ('Hinduism has consistently held to consciousness as the irreducible quality of existence'), Jainism (whose adherents 'remained an effective religious community by reason of their solidarity, their business and commercial enterprise, their wealth and munificence, the comparatively high degree of literacy among them, their tenacious adherence to the theory of "animation," and their code of moral and religious discipline'), and Buddhism which died out in the land of its birth, only to rise again and flourish on foreign soil, with Buddha as a deity in most cases. The brief chapters on the Parsis and Sikhs are concise and to the point.

Judaism is treated rather as a religion in itself than as a forerunner of Christianity; and this gives strength and perspective to the chapter. Christianity is treated reverently but in a manner consistent with the other chapters. In conclusion, he states that the greatest religious progress has been made in America, because

'in Europe, Catholic and State Churches have had the right of way. While in America Christianity has been denominational, its spirit has developed peculiarly *inter*denominational and *un*denominational activities, which have had their reflex influences on doctrine. The Roman Church of America has developed as a unit, showing no disloyalty to Rome, but conscious of a somewhat national character and an American destiny. Protestant Churches have long sustained a Federal Council through which inter-changes of opinion might be registered and co-operative social enterprises undertaken. . . . There is a growing sense of obligation to the underprivileged, the duty of benevolence toward their minds and bodies, and a lively interest in the principles

by which a sound society is built. . . . If there is a major problem and incentive for the Christian Church to-day, it is the secularism manifest within and around it' (pp. 423-424).

The chapter on Islam is treated in the same manner as all former ones. The history of the religion is traced from the very beginning, tracing all the major upheavals down to the present day. It is still fundamentally the same as it was in the beginning, and there have been no major changes since 1500 A.D.

'Mohammed is still the Prophet. The *Kaba* is still the symbol of religious unity, and of the common consciousness. All Moslems still swear by Allah. The faith is still conservative; but there are liberals in the fold. . . . The veil has been discarded in polite society. . . . The fortunes of Islam lie with the liberals . . .' (p. 463).

Religions must be compared, and this raises three major problems. It must be discovered 'what each religion is *in itself* and *as a whole*.' There is the question of similarities and differences. Then there is the problem of 'stages' in development, if there are any.

'Comparative studies throw light on many problems besides God, revelation and inspiration,' and 'while comparisons may tend to modify orthodox interpretations . . . they do not provide refuge for the unbeliever. Rather, they tend to show the essence of religion at its best' (p. 468).

This book points the way, because its method shows how religions have developed, who their leaders were, what their beliefs and ethics were, and what they stand for in the present day. It is not a book to be read at a sitting, for it abounds in technical terms; but its material is sound and interesting. It is to be recommended to priest and intelligent layman alike, and will serve students excellently.

RANDOLPH C. MILLER.

Yale University.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CHURCH AND MARRIAGE.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*.

SIR,

The tremendous increase in the number of Dissolutions of Marriage in the last sixty years in this country has been one of the main factors responsible for the Report on the Church and Marriage, which was presented to the Convocations of Canterbury and York in the first week of June, 1935.

As the Report states :—

In 1871, out of 190,112 Marriages, there were 166 Dissolutions; proportion 1 in 1,145.

In 1933, out of 318,191 Marriages, there were 4,042 Dissolutions; proportion 1 in 79.

This is a very great jump, although there are many reasons to account for the difference, not least being the increased facilities for obtaining divorce to-day as compared with 60 years ago.

However, it is clearly revealed by the figures that divorce is on the increase; so much so that the Church is moved to do something about it.

But there is something these figures do not reveal.

How many of the 189,946 marriages of 1871 (deducting the dissolutions) were *real* marriages? By which of course is meant, how many fulfilled not merely the requirement of life-long union, but also gave genuine expression to all the other ideals implicit in Christian Marriage?

No figures can be quoted, but it must not be assumed that only in the 166 marriages where divorce was secured was there failure to achieve the ideal. It is foolish to assume that only when a divorce is sought has a marriage broken down. There may be disastrous failure, failure quite as important, even though divorce is not resorted to.

There is the danger that this Report, concerned so largely as it is with the question of Divorce, will make it appear that lifelong union is by far the most important aspect of Christian Marriage; that so long as this is achieved, the rest does not greatly matter.

It is always made to appear a deadly sin when the promise to maintain lifelong union is broken, but little notice is taken when the promise to 'love, comfort, honour and keep' is broken.

Once again the Church is officially discussing Marriage, and centring attention upon this one aspect to the almost total exclusion of everything else.

There is much that is admirable in the Report, not least in that it sets out quite plainly the real issue in the question of divorce. How to legislate, or how not to legislate? That is the problem.

This is brought out clearly in Minority Report No. 1, and cannot better be stated than in its own words.

'The difference between us lies in the interpretation of the words of Christ. Did He lay down a law which His followers must in loyalty obey, or did He hold up an ideal and leave His followers to legislate for themselves with that ideal before them?'

Here, for the Church, is the crux of the matter.

The Majority Report voices the view that not only have we an ideal set before us, but also the view that the ideal can, indeed should, be enforced by legal means; by penalties and threats and punishments.

The Minority Report voices the view that whilst we have an ideal set before us, our main task is to hold up that ideal, and win response, not enforce it. Further, it states that while legislation is inevitable because of the failures, it is required, not as a punishment, but to afford relief. In this matter Christ let His followers free.

So long as the discussion is directed to the question of Divorce, the position of the Majority Report seems to be very convincing, and it looks as though the majority in Convocation will support it.

But the real weakness of the position is revealed when we turn from divorce to consider those other factors, besides lifelong union, which constitute Christian Marriage.

If it could be equally demonstrated by statistics that 1 in 79 of the marriages which took place in 1933 had failed in the promise to 'love, comfort, honour and keep,' would we have a similar appointment of Joint Committees, and would their Report urge that legislation be brought to bear upon the problem?

It may seem possible to prevent two people from breaking their vow of lifelong union, by the threat that if they do they will be cut off from the Sacraments of the Church. Does it seem possible by the same means to

prevent two people from breaking their vow to 'love, comfort, honour and keep'?

As a matter of practical concern, how, in the Church of England, is it proposed that such disciplinary action shall be taken? The divorced person is to be excommunicated. How many of its members understand what excommunication means? How can a person so cut off from Communion be prevented from making his Communion? Anyone can walk into any one of 99 Churches out of 100 next Sunday, and make his Communion. The latest revision of the Prayer Book so amended the 1st Rubric of the Communion Service that instead of it being *necessary* to signify attendance, it it now merely *convenient*. The old Rubric will have to be restored, and strictly enforced, despite the fact that the revision was made just because it was one of those things which proved not to work.

There are thirteen Resolutions in this Report, all very much concerned with what shall be done because so many marriages break down.

There is a Resolution—one only—which deals with what might be done to prevent the breakdown.

Some will feel that this is a situation which needs remedy.

We can have a Committee appointed to discuss what to do about Resolution 11 of Lambeth 1930, which is concerned simply with Divorce.

But Lambeth 1930 also said, 'We think that there should be special preparation for marriage for persons between their engagment and the wedding. This need not be official or elaborate. It may be done in part at least through suitable literature.'

No Committee has been appointed to deal with this.

Yet it is still true to say that all that happens in most parishes when two people approach the church for marriage is that they give details as to their age, names, occupations, etc., to the Verger, and learn from him how much the fees are. Three weeks or so later, they are married.

If that marriage does not in later years fulfil the Christian ideal, where lies the real blame?

What proportion of the 4,042 marriages which resulted in divorce in 1933 had been solemnised in Church? In how many of the cases did anyone, prior to the marriage, take any trouble to find out whether the couple understood the Christian view of marriage?

If the Church wants to exercise discipline, might it not start here, and compel those who officiate at marriages to see that adequate instruction is given beforehand?

But that opens up the vast question as to what kind of instruction this should be.

To refer back to the Lambeth Report and the words 'suitable literature.'

When is any guidance going to be given as to what may be considered suitable literature, to be used either by the clergy, or to be advised by them, in instruction about marriage?

So far the Church has not produced any.

But since Lambeth 1930 a whole flood of literature has been produced, and many publications quote the Lambeth Resolution as the reason for their issue.

Would Lambeth approve?

N. S. HOUGH.

Holy Trinity Church,
Southwark.

MODERN TEACHING ON BAPTISM.

SIR,

I shall be glad if you will kindly allow me to draw the attention of your readers to a pamphlet entitled *What Baptism Means,* by the Rev. H. D. A. Major, D.D., Principal of Ripon Hall. This pamphlet has been written at the request of a parish priest for putting into the hands of parents and godparents either before or at baptism. Most clergy, when notice of a baptism is given, hand the parent a card on which the necessary particulars may be given for the register. How often they have wished that there were some simple, straightforward explanation of the service and its significance which could be given at the same time. Here is just the pamphlet required, written simply, attractively printed, and costing only one penny. It is hoped that many parochial clergymen will purchase copies for free distribution to the parents of the children whom they baptize and thus ensure a better understanding of the nature of this sacrament. Copies can be obtained from the office of the Union.

T. J. WOOD.

The Church House,
Westminster,
London, S.W.1.

A PLEA FOR A PROFOUNDER PULPIT AND SIMPLER SERVICES.

SIR,

With reference to pages 462-3 and 466-7 of the *Modern Churchman* for October would it not be possible to find some members of the church like the Dean of Liverpool, who would be brave enough to put their churches at the disposal of other denominations for special services which might be announced beforehand from the pulpit. I feel certain that such an arrangement would give the Church of England a wider outlook and a more tolerant attitude towards other denominations.

Take myself for instance. I was brought up in the Church of England and look upon it as my Church, and although now I am unable to believe in all that is written in the Gospel, or in the Creed, still I feel that it is the only place in which I am inclined to worship, and I would gladly go there, if one could only worship God in Spirit and in Truth instead of having to follow services replete with references to many things which I find it impossible to believe.

B. WRENICK.

Ashley Rise,
Walton-on-Thames.
December 25th, 1935.

THE CLERGY AS SOCIALIST PROPAGANDISTS.

SIR,

I was rather amused on reading the Rev. J. C. Hardwick's critique of Canon Barry's *The Relevance of the Church* that your eminent reviewer should have quoted with approval a paragraph from the writings of Messrs. John Strachey and H. J. Laski to the effect that 'Capitalism as at present organised has broken down in the sphere of economics.' Mr. Hardwick adds dogmatically on his own account: 'This . . . will be rejected only by those whom invincible ignorance or some form of terror of the truth has blinded.'

The facility with which nowadays so many of the clergy—even the more distinguished—drug themselves with the cheap nostrums of stale nineteenth century Socialistic thought is amazing. I will plead guilty neither to 'in-

vincible ignorance' nor to 'blind terror,' yet I wholeheartedly reject the Strachey-Laski diagnosis.

In the 'eighties of the last century Capitalism was rapidly dying, according to my old friend the late H. M. Hyndman, who was the real intellectual god-father of English Socialism. It has been dying ever since, according to its critics. Yet it is still alive and vigorous, still controlling world economic affairs.

Modern Capitalism found this country a nation of 12,000,000—mainly penurious workers—and to-day supports on the same limited land-area a nation of 40,000,000 in an incomparably higher condition of material well-being. It has utilised Science with dynamic individual initiative in every walk of life. It is extraordinarily elastic. By its Joint Stock Company system it has linked individual property with organised co-operative effort. Its credit and financial mechanism have achieved marvels in the development of national and international trade. It has opened up new worlds. It has constantly adapted itself to new conditions. Its basis is individual ownership and the laws that govern it are a reflection of the biological laws of nature. So far it has saved the society which succeeded the feudal system from the most grinding tyrannies and the modern state from the grossest corruption.

Stage by stage in this process it has elaborated the most extensive and intensive measures of social amelioration ever known in history.

There is not one iota of evidence to show that any form of Socialism, or any other conceivable system, could have rivalled the achievements of Capitalism. There are, on the contrary, ample reasons to suppose that they would have brought the social order to swift disaster or crystallised it into a static organisation incapable of change or growth. That Capitalism is constantly being modified or adapted to altered conditions is the greatest tribute to its vitality. What Socialists and Social Idealists generally do is to compare an existing system—with all the weaknesses, errors and sins associated with anything of human achievement—with an Ideal of their own imagining which has not existed and never will exist. As a process of thought it is beneath contempt.

It is no part of the object of this communication to comment on the other portions of Mr. Hardwick's review.

F. Victor Fishers.

49 Haverstock Hill,
Hampstead, N.W.3.
December 27th, 1935.

A MODERNIST INSET FOR PARISH MAGAZINES.

Sir,

A modern parish magazine is surely a necessity in a parish to-day. To help forward its advent may I suggest:—

1. S.S. Teachers' section. Adapt *Jesus by Eyewitness* or *Lessons on the Way*.

2. 'Men Once Believed'—include such items as Creation 4004 B.C.; Burgon's theory of inspiration (*English Modernism*, p. 117); Prayer of Unction (*M.C.*, June, 1933, p. 118).

3. Exposition on some point of doctrine or custom—in very simple form: *e.g.* Pryke's *Modernism as a Working Faith*; Dearmer's 'Three hour Service' (*M.C.*, December, 1935).

4. Revisions either authorised in a diocese (Birmingham, Catechism) or the work of an individual (Major's 'Occasional Offices').

5. Reviews, giving data not criticism, that would be to the advantage of both preacher and congregation.

6. To mitigate the charge that Modernism has no room for emotion or beauty, poems or sections of beautiful prose could be added: *e.g. Reality*, p. 201; 'Rhymes,' Studdert Kennedy; 'Lotus Pond,' p. 10 of Trine's *In Tune with the Infinite*.

All these in one pamphlet! Why not? The divisions could be clear to the editor, even if they were not apparent on paper, *e.g.* sermon outline could contain an old belief, an exposition showing development to new position, the new position (revision), finally a quotation of beauty either of prose or poetry.

Lastly, I will take 100 copies per month.

C. GODFREY THOMAS.

2 Clarendon Villas,
Widcombe Hill, Bath.
December 16th, 1935.

[We have received several letters in support of the Rev. R. D. Richardson's suggestion, but by no means sufficient to justify the taking of practical steps.—ED., M.C.]

THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION.
COUNCIL ELECTION, 1936.

SIR,

I shall be glad if you will kindly give publicity to the following official notice to members of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

By the Constitution the following elected members of the Council retire on the day of the Annual General Meeting in May, 1936, and are not eligible for re-election, *viz.*:—Rev. F. G. Given-Wilson, Rev. G. L. H. Harvey, Rev. H. Pegg, Rev. Canon C. E. Raven, Rev. F. I. L. Rees, Mr. A. H. Self, Mr. H. F. Walker, Rev. J. R. C. Webb, and Mr. J. W. Williams.

The following co-opted members of the Council retire at the same time, but are eligible for election, *viz.*:—Rev. J. S. Boys-Smith, Rev. R. G. Griffith, Mr. R. B. Henderson, Mrs. Howse, Miss H. Hubbard, Rev. R. D. Richardson, Rev. Professor N. Sykes, and Mr. J. W. Walker.

All other members of the Council, as in the list published in this magazine, continue to serve.

Ten members are to be elected to the Council this year, and the nominations of candidates must reach the Secretary not later than March 1st. The names must be proposed and seconded by members of the Union, and the consent of the nominees should first be obtained. If more than ten nominations are received, voting papers will be sent to all members of the Union.

The Annual General Meeting of the Union will be held on Wednesday, May 20th, 1936.

T. J. WOOD.

The Church House, Westminster, London, S.W.1.
January 8th, 1936.